

DOUBLE NUMBER, PRICE 3s.

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Perse School House, Cambridge.
A. D. GODLEY, Hon.D.Litt., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

Board of Management:

Prof. R. S. OONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A., *Chairman.*

Prof. H. J. DUNSON, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*

Prof. A. G. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Prof. GILBERT MURRAY, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L. *With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.*

WALTERS, M.A.

OSWALD BAILEY, M.A., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*
Prof. SIR WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Sir W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., Montreal; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XXXIV

MAY-JUNE, 1920

Nos. 3, 4

CONTENTS

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:	PAGE	REVIEWS—continued:	PAGE
Cornificius as Daphnis? TENNEY FRANK ..	49	The Use of <i>Φόρος</i> in Fifth-Century Greek Literature. G.-E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ ..	68
Some Vicissitudes of <i>Eth. Nic.</i> IV. 8. 6. C. M. MULVANY ..	51	Miscellanæa. FRANK GRANGER ..	69
Polybiana XX. 12. 1. W. R. PATON ..	54	Some School Books. E. ..	70
Sophoclea. A. C. PEARSON ..	56	Possidius' Life of St. Augustine. C. H. EVELYN-WHITE ..	71
Terentiana (Continued from C.R. XXXII. 99-102). J. S. PHILLIMORE ..	57	A Latin Anthology. J. WIGHT DUFF ..	73
NOTES:		SHORT NOTICES:	
Sappho's Nereid-Ode. H. IDRIS BELL ..	63	The Rise of the Equites in the Third Century of the Roman Empire. T. ..	74
Euripides, <i>Heracles</i> 725. R. B. APPLETON ..	63	The Syntax of High-School Latin: A Co-operative Study. W. E. P. PANTIN ..	74
Plato, <i>Theaetetus</i> 188b. W. H. D. ROUSE ..	63	MEETING OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION ..	75
Aeschylus, <i>Ennemenides</i> 684. CEDRIC M. RAPHAEL ..	64	OBITUARY:	
The Meaning of <i>Kpōis</i> as a Medical Term. E. WITHINGTON ..	64	Roger James Cholmeley ..	76
An Interpretation of Horace <i>Odes</i> III. 3. NORMAN W. D. WITT ..	65	NOTES AND NEWS ..	77
Martial II. xiv. 1. EXUL ..	66	CORRESPONDENCE ..	78
REVIEWS:		BOOKS RECEIVED ..	80
The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII. W. H. D. ROUSE ..	67		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 151-155, WEST 25TH STREET.

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. 6d. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free.
Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free.

The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

Annual Subscription - ONE GUINEA.

Entrance Fee - TWO GUINEAS.

PRESIDENT—WALTER LEAF, Esq., Litt.D., D.Litt.

OBJECTS.—The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies was founded in 1879 for the following objects:—

- I.—To advance the study of Greek language, literature, and art, and to illustrate the history of the Greek race in the ancient, Byzantine, and Neo-Hellenic periods, by the publication of memoirs and unedited documents or monuments in a Journal to be issued periodically.
 - II.—To collect drawings, facsimiles, transcripts, plans, and photographs of Greek inscriptions, MSS., works of art, ancient sites and remains, and with this view to invite travellers to communicate to the Society notes or sketches of archaeological and topographical interest.
- To organize means by which members of the Society may have increased facilities for visiting ancient sites and pursuing archaeological researches in countries which, at any time, have been the sites of Hellenic civilization.

Application for membership, or for information about the Society, should be addressed to the Secretary, at 19 Bloomsbury Square, W.C. 1.

The *Journal of Hellenic Studies* and other publications of the Society are issued by Messrs. Macmillan & Co., Ltd., and can be purchased from any bookseller, the published price to non-members being 30s. net per volume or 15s. net each part. Members are entitled to receive a copy of the *Journal* on publication during their membership, and can purchase back volumes at the subscription rate of 21s. per annum.

Members also have the use of a well-equipped library at 19 Bloomsbury Square and of a large collection of lantern-slides illustrative of Classical Studies.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. E. Norman Gardiner, 2, The College, Epsom; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Professor Pearson, Etonfield, King's Gap, Hoylake, Cheshire, and Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss Hilda Livesey, 155, Oswald Road, Chorltoncum-Hardy, near Manchester; Miss Margaret Hooker, Secondary School for Girls, Erdington, Birmingham; Mr. H. A. Ormerod, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss Wilkinson, Badminton House, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. Strudwick, City of London School for Girls, Carmelite Street, E.C.4; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss M. L. Newman, 7, College Street, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; and Professor Dawson, Northcote House, Apollo Bander, Bombay.

The Classical Review

MAY—JUNE, 1920

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

CORNIFICIUS AS DAPHNIS?

CORNIFICIUS, the poet, orator, and man of public affairs, to whom Catullus sent what seem to be his last verses, was by no means the least significant of the 'new poets.' We still have the letters which Cicero sent him, with a copy of the *Orator* that had been written chiefly for the purpose of combating the programme of the literary group to which Cornificius belonged. Cicero there, with charming deference to a man at least twenty-five years younger than he, writes: 'Your absence has given me the courage to write some things of which you, I fear, will not approve.'¹ As though Cornificius, had he been at Rome, would have overawed him! This was after the Atticist leaders Calvus and Calidius had died, and I think we may assume from Cicero's tone that Cornificius had inherited the mantle from them.

Later tradition played havoc with the reputation of Cornificius, probably because, having died in the defence of the republican cause, he was ignored by the powerful Augustans, at whose mercy lay the fame of their immediate predecessors. Curiously enough the Virgilian scholiasts constantly connected him with characters of Virgil's *Eclogues* in the most confusing manner, now as a friend, now as an enemy of Virgil.

Wissowa (Pauly-Wissowa, IV. 1628) has definitely shown that in the earlier, the more reliable, tradition the two men are assumed to be friends. Asconius, who wrote a pamphlet, *contra obtretractores Vergilii*, does not mention this

poet as one of them: Macrobius twice assumes that Virgil imitates Cornificius (VI. 4, 12; VI. 5, 13); the Verona scholiast on *Eclogue* VII. 22 cites the opinion of commentators who thought the highly praised Codrus was our poet, and Philargyrius on *Eclogue* III. 106 quotes Cornificius as repeating words heard from Virgil himself. Indeed, a study of Virgil's early works and the theory of art expressed there will show that Virgil, even after becoming a member of the Augustan classicist group, remained loyal to his devotion toward the 'new poets,' and that it was the fashion to consider him as one of that group.²

There is, in fact, good reason for the opinion cited by the Verona scholiast that the Codrus of the seventh *Eclogue* was Cornificius.³

Nymphae, noster amor, Libethrides, aut mihi
carmen,
quale meo Codro, concede (proxima Phoebi
versibus ille facit).

The guesses of the scholiasts regarding the characters of the *Eclogues* are usually stupid and founded upon misplaced fancies, but in this instance a direct quotation from Valgius, one of Virgil's early friends, places the statement on an unusually firm basis. The scholiast (*loc. cit.*) continues:

similiter autem hunc Codrum in elegiis Valgius
honorifice appellat et quadam in ecloga de
eo ait:

² Cf. Horace, I. 10, 44; Virgil's Theory of Art, *Class. Phil.* 1920.

³ Some also thought Codrus was Virgil, which is, of course, not possible; others that he was Cinna. The last view is precluded by the fact that Virgil mentions Cinna by name, IX. 35.

¹ *Ad Fam.* XII. 17, 2: Me scito dum tu absis quasi occasionem quandam et licentiam nactum scribere audacius, etc. The whole letter deserves reading.

Codrusque ille canit quali tu voce canebas
atque solet numeros dicere, Cinna, tuos,
dulcior ut nunquam Pylio profluxerit ore
Nestoris aut < doc > to pectore Dem < odoci >,
etc.

From this passage it has been soundly concluded that Codrus was celebrated more than once by Valgius; that he was not merely a fictitious pastoral character in Valgius, since he is connected immediately with Cinna; that he was a poet of the neoteric group standing close to Cinna, and presumably living on into the forties, when Virgil and Valgius were beginning to write.

Now it seems to me that all the probabilities point to Cornificius and no other. Since Valgius and Virgil were very close friends, the Codrus mentioned by the two is probably the same person, and the scholiast who identifies the Codrus of Virgil with Cornificius and with the Codrus of Valgius has given a plausible hypothesis. A second reason for supposing the view of the scholiast right is that besides Gallus (who did not need to be given an assumed name at this time) Cornificius was the only important¹ one of the neoteric poets still living when Virgil wrote his first *Eclogues*—the time, presumably, also of Valgius' *Ecloga*. With what other poet could Valgius, then, have connected Cinna the friend of Catullus? Thirdly, Cornificius is the only poet for whom we can find a reason for such anonymity in Valgius and Virgil. In his case the reason is simple. Though he had, like most of the neoterici, once joined the ranks of Julius Caesar, and had accepted high office from him in Syria and Africa, he had let himself be drawn over by Cicero into the party of Brutus and Cassius, and, true to his promises, had defended Africa against the triumvirs, even after the death of the liberators. It was early in 41, apparently, that he met his death² in the service of the lost

cause. The time had not yet come when his friends could with good grace name him in eulogies, even apart from the consideration that his name was difficult to fit into hexameter verse.

It is tempting to proceed a step further and suggest that Virgil's exquisite elegy, the fifth *Eclogue*, may be a funeral dirge over this very Cornificius. Virgil's *Eclogues* are not mere imitative studies; most of them are parts of his life and thought, and apparently all but the fifth, and possibly the second, contain recognisable references to friends of his circle. Why not the fifth? Virgil shows in the tenth *Eclogue* that he has learned from Moschus the easy lesson of turning the traditional literary dirge into a personal elegy, and it is as difficult for us as it was for Virgil's ancient readers to escape the conviction that a personal experience underlay this elegy. The reference is, of course, not to Caesar: the contents preclude that hasty conjecture. Nor can this be a reference to either of Virgil's brothers: only a poet could deserve the adoration here expressed. It is a poet surely, and one who actually loved Virgil's singers (ll. 48-52), and those singers are not shepherds of the mythical age, but Virgil's contemporaries (ll. 86-87). Hence, unless the *mise-en-scène* is wholly confused in Virgil's mind, Daphnis is a poet, by no means undistinguished, who has just died when the poem was composed. The *Eclogue* is not one of the earlier ones, as its ending proves. It is generally dated in 41 B.C., and it was in 41, probably early in the year, that Cornificius was killed. I know of no other poet whose times would accord with the requirements of this song.

One might proceed to find allusions in the poem. For instance, l. 29 might be taken as a reference to the Syrian wars of Cornificius (Cic. *Ad Fam.* XII. 19) and the *Poenos etiam genuisse leones* (l. 27) to the scene of his death ('extinctum . . . crudeli funere'); but the reader of Virgil prefers not to press such points. Obviously Virgil has, for good reasons, chosen not to make allusions too striking. Cornificius had, after all, from the point of view of the court, met a just doom as a rebel. Later Virgil did not hesitate to show

¹ Valerius Cato was then a crabbed old schoolmaster, Furius Bibaculus had lost the precarious standing he had once possessed, and Tigidius (Suet. *Gram.* 4) need hardly be considered. Cinna is generally identified with the poet who met his death at Caesar's funeral, though it must be confessed that references to him in Virgil and Valgius make this assumption doubtful.

² St. Jerome, 2, p. 139 Sch.

his admiration for men of the republican cause like Cato, Brutus, and Pompey, but during the very turmoil of civil strife that could not well be done.

It may well be, then, that the song *maestius lacrimis Simonideis* which Catullus at the end begged from his

friend Cornificius was accorded the latter, even without a prayer, by the poet who had been the pupil of both.

TENNEY FRANK.

*Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Ind., U.S.A.*

SOME VICISSITUDES OF ETH. NIC. IV. 8, 6.

§ 1.

AMONG the early references to the *Nicomachean Ethics* that Susemihl has collected in the preface to his text of *E.E.* are three extracts from a scholiast on the *Rhetoric*. In the first extract (*Schol. in Rhet.* p. 159, 15 ff.; Spengel, *apud* Susemihl, p. xxv) we are told that Aristotle discussed the varieties of *γελοία*, not only *ἐν τοῖς περὶ ποιητικῆς*,¹ but also *ἐν τοῖς Νικομαχείοις ἠθικοῖς περὶ τὸ τέλος πον τοῦ δ*. Then is given the distinction between the truthful man, the boastful, and the ironical.² In the second extract we read λέγει δὲ ἐκεῖ ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης that Wittiness is δι' ἀνάπασιν ἡμῶν εὐρημένη, and its extremes are τὸ ἄγριον and τὸ βωμολόχον. The third extract is given by Susemihl thus:

1128a 16. τῇ—25. εὐσχημοσύνην. Pergit idem v. 30 sqq. μεσότης δ' ἐν τούτοις ἡ ἐπιδεξιότης, ἣ χρῆται καὶ ἡ παλαιὰ (sic!) κωμωδία καὶ ὁ ἐλευθέριος καὶ ὁ πεπαιδευμένος.

Susemihl's note of exclamation is not astonishing, since Aristotle, in the passage of the *Ethics* to which the scholiast is referring, attributes to 'the old comedies' *αἰσχρολογία*, of which he disapproves. His words are (IV. 8, 5-6, 1128a 19-25):

ἔστι γάρ τινα πρέποντα τῷ τοιούτῳ [τῷ ἐπιεικεῖ καὶ ἐλευθερίῳ] λέγειν ἐν παιδιᾷς μέρει καὶ ἀκούειν, καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἐλευθερίου παιδιὰ διαφέρει τῆς τοῦ ἀνδραποδώδους, καὶ πεπαιδευμένου καὶ ἀπαιδεύτου. ἴδοι δ' ἂν τις καὶ ἐκ τῶν κωμωδιῶν τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ τῶν καινῶν.

¹ *Rhet.* III. 18, 7, 1419b 5; cf. I. 11, 29, 1372a 1.

² Cf. ἡθικὴ κωμωδία τὰ τε βωμολόχα καὶ τὰ εἰρωνικὰ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀλαζόνων (Anon. *περὶ κωμωδίας* at end of Christ's *Poetics*).

τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἦν γελοῖον ἢ αἰσχρολογία, τοῖς δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ ὑπόνοια· διαφέρει δ' οὐ μικρὸν ταῦτα πρὸς εὐσχημοσύνην.

In this passage, as Aspasius saw (Heylbut, p. 125, 32), by τοῖς μὲν are meant the authors of the old comedies, by τοῖς δὲ the authors of the recent. But in the paraphrase called after Andronicus of Rhodes or after Heliodorus (Heylbut, *Heliodori Paraphr.* p. 82, 25 ff.) the passage is interpreted as follows:

τοῦτο δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν κωμωδιῶν γίνεται δῆλον τῶν τε παλαιῶν καὶ τῶν νέων· ἐν γὰρ ταῖς κωμωδίαις οἱ μὲν φαύλους τινὰς καὶ ἀνδραποδώδεις ὑποκρινόμενοι γελοῖα καὶ ἡδέα ἡγούνται τὰ αἰσχρά, οἱ δὲ ἐλευθερίους τινὰς καὶ ἐπιδεξίους καὶ ἐπιεικεῖς ὑποκρινόμενοι τὰ μεθ' ὑπονοίας· ταῦτα δὲ οὐ μικρῶ τινι διαφέρει ἀλλήλων πρὸς εὐσχημοσύνην.

This interpretation makes Aristotle put together the old and the new comedies as presenting, both of them, instances of ribaldry and innuendo. From this just a little carelessness or forgetfulness, so as to cause attention to be concentrated on ὑπόνοια, of which Aristotle approves, to the exclusion of αἰσχρολογία, will bring us to the view that we find in the scholiast on the *Rhetoric*.

§ 2.

In the *Nicomachean Ethics* misinterpreted as by this scholiast (there is no mention of comedy in the parallel passages, 1234a 4 ff. and 1193a 11 ff., of *E.E.* and *M.M.*) we have, so I would suggest, the ultimate source of the passage on jesting in Cicero, *de Officiis* I. §§ 103-4.

There are differences between the Aristotelian and Ciceronian passages. Cicero considers games as well as jokes;

stops short of making a positive virtue of jesting; and is mainly concerned with its limitations. Still, within limits, he approves of it, and is thus on the side of Aristotle as against the Stoics, who taught *αὐστηροὺς . . . εἶναι πάντας τοὺς σπουδαίους κ.τ.λ.* (Diog. Laert. VII. 117; cf. the description of Zeno, *ibid.* 16; also of Pythagoras, *ibid.* VIII. 20, and *apud* Holden on § 108); he has something like Aristotle's rest-theory of amusement (§ 103), and he has the two species of jests (§ 104). What is particularly to be noticed (for so far his agreement with the *Ethics* might be accidental) is that he expresses the same view of the Old Comedy—that it was distinguished for refined jesting—as the scholiast on the *Rhetoric* thought was the view taken in the *Ethics*. Cicero's words (§ 104) are:

Duplex omnino est jocandi genus: unum inliberale petulans, flagitiosum obscenum, alterum elegans urbanum, ingeniosum facetum. Quo genere non modo Plautus noster et Atticorum antiqua comoedia, sed etiam philosophorum Socraticorum libri referti sunt, multaque multorum facete dicta, ut ea quae a sene Catone collecta sunt, quae vocant ἀποφθέγματα.

This view of the Old Comedy, though the notes in Holden show no surprise, surely is unusual. But it is, I submit, readily intelligible if Cicero, or his source, thought this view was taken in the *Nicomachean Ethics*; on this supposition we have to do only with a case of judgment paralysed by respect for supposed authority. The well-known passage *de Fin.* V. 5, 12, shows that the *Nicomachean* treatise was ordinarily attributed in Cicero's time to Aristotle, and was considered to be in any case a faithful exposition of genuine Peripatetic doctrine.

§ 3.

Though it should be granted that this passage (I. § 104) of the *de Officiis* echoes the *Nicomachean Ethics*, it would not of necessity follow that Cicero had read that treatise himself. I would rather suggest that the whole passage—less the local colouring, the mention of Plautus and Cato—may have been taken from Panaetius *περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος*, Cicero's ordinary source for Books I. and II.

That at least the mention of the Socratics came from Panaetius may seem probable if we compare this passage in the *de Off.* with a passage in the *Brutus* (§ 292, quoted by Holden) and also with a note in Diogenes Laertius. In the *de Off.* we have been told that *philosophorum Socraticorum libri* are full of a kind of jesting that is *elegans urbanum, ingeniosum facetum*. In the *Brutus* Atticus says, *ironiam illam, quam in Socrate dicunt fuisse, quae ille in Platonis et Xenophontis et Aeschini libris utitur, facetam et elegantem puto*. The epithets take us back to our passage of the *de Off.*; but the presence of Aeschines in the list that here replaces the vaguer 'Socratic philosophers' of the *de Off.* takes us off to Diog. Laert. II. 64 (RP 240d). Here we are told that, according to Panaetius, of all the Socratic dialogues (*πάντων τῶν Σωκρατικῶν διαλόγων*) those of Plato, Xenophon, Antisthenes, and Aeschines were ἀληθεῖς, i.e., I presume, they faithfully represented Socrates. In this passage of Diog. Laert. we get the two passages of Cicero, as it were, united—the *de Off.* with its *philosophi Socratici*, and the *Brutus* with its enumeration of Plato, Xenophon, Aeschines. These three passages, then, taken together perhaps afford some ground for attributing to Panaetius the remark about the Socratics in the *de Off.*; in addition to the general probability that this remark came from Panaetius *περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος* as being Cicero's main source for *de Off.* I. and II.

But whatever encourages us to believe the mention of the Socratic philosophers to be due to Panaetius, makes it at the same time reasonable also to assign to him the mention of the Old Comedy, and so leave for Cicero only the addition of Plautus as a parallel to the *Atticorum antiqua comoedia*, and of Cato with the *multa multorum facete dicta* beside the Socratics.

There is nothing improbable in the view that Panaetius may have known and used the *Nicomachean Ethics*. This work is thought to have been mentioned by Sotion about 190 B.C. (see the remark in Sussehl, *E.E.* p. xviii with reference to *de Fin.* V. 5, 12); and if

that be correct, we may presume that the book was accessible to Panaetius. Further, what Strabo (*apud* RP 533a) says of his pupil Posidonius, *πολὺν . . . παρ' αὐτῷ . . . τὸ ἀριστοτελίζον*, appears to have been true of himself. He avoided the *tristitia* and *asperitas*, the *acerbitas sententiarum* of the Stoics, and *semper habuit in ore Platonem, Aristotelem*, etc. (*de Fin.* IV. 28, 79); and that he approximated to Aristotle on various important points of moral doctrine may be seen from RP 529-31. Though he remained a professed Stoic, we may call him the Antiochus of the second century.

If these two hypotheses be correct, that the attribution of refined jesting to the Old Comedy in *de Off.* I. § 104 is due to *E.N.* IV. 8, 6 misunderstood, and that this misunderstanding was already in Panaetius *περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος*, then the *de Off.* preserves a reference to the *Nicomachean Ethics* that comes down from the middle of the second century B.C., for Panaetius, who died about 110 B.C., had finished that treatise thirty years earlier (*de Off.* III. 2, 8). This consideration may lend some interest to, and perhaps in some measure excuse, these speculations.

§ 4.

We have seen how *τοῖς μὲν . . . τοῖς δέ* in *E.N.* IV. 8, 6 gave rise to misunderstandings of Aristotle's meaning. But in one respect his meaning seems to have been too clear for at least one reader, and the text was boldly changed. Aspasius correctly interprets *τοῖς μὲν . . . τοῖς δέ*, as was remarked in § 1. But he continues—at least our MSS. of him continue—with (Heylbut, p. 125, 34) *διαφέρει δ' οὐδὲν πρὸς εὐσχημοσύνην ἢ φανερώς αἰσχρολογεῖν ἢ μόνον ἐμφαίνειν*.¹ Unless this was originally a

marginal note by which a virtuous reader of the commentary relieved his feelings, it was a deliberate alteration of the text (*οὐδὲν* for *οὐ μικρόν*) intended to make Aristotle moral: in the interests of morality its author, who of course may have been earlier than Aspasius, either deliberately introduced a reading he knew to be false, or went on the assumption that Aristotle being virtuous could not have said what the MSS. declared him to have said.

For here in *E.N.* Aristotle goes further in assigning importance to decency of language than in *Rhet.* III. 2, 13, 1405b 8 (see Cope III. p. 32). There he rejects the view that one expression is as decent as another if the meaning is the same; whereas the Stoics afterwards maintained *ὁ σοφὸς εὐθυρρημονήσει* (Cic. *ad Fam.* IX. 22, 5: cf. *de Off.* I. §§ 127-8, with Holden's notes).² Here the jests he approves for the good man may not only be personal (§§ 7-9), but lewd provided they be clothed in decent language: his good man, being *εὐτράπελος* and *ἐπιδέξιος*, will excel in *double entendre*. For IV. 8, 6 can only mean that *ὑπόνοια* is suitable to the *ἐλευθέριος* and *πεπαιδευμένος*, and the difference between *ὑπόνοια* and *αἰσχρολογία* is in expression only, not in thought. This falls very far short of Burke's remark, in the passage of the *Reflections* beginning, 'It is now sixteen or seventeen years since,' that vice itself lost half its evil by losing all its grossness. Still, it is in its degree open to the sarcasm Newman poured on Burke in *The Idea of a University* VIII. 8, as being 'an illustration of the ethical temperament of a civilised age,' for which 'scandals, vulgarities, whatever shocks, whatever disgusts, are offences of the first order.' And St. Paul would doubtless have included Aristotle's *ὑπόνοια* in the *μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπελία ἃ οὐκ ἀνήκεν* of

¹ A little earlier (vv. 20-2) Aspasius says of the *βωμολόχος* that he *οὐδενὸς φείδεται, οὔτε φίλου οὔτε ἐχθροῦ· ἐνόστο δὲ οὐδὲ τῶν θεῶν, καθάπερ οἱ τὰς παλαιὰς κομωδίας ποιήσαντες· ὑπὸ γὰρ βωμολοχίας οὐδὲ τῶν θεῶν ἀπέειχοντο*. Is all this about the gods out of his own head? Or did he find *τῶν θεῶν* as a variant for *τῶν ἀλλῶν* in 1128a 35 and explain both readings? We seem to have the same phenomenon, i.e. explanation of two variants, p. 114, 4 (*E.N.* IV. 3, 27, 1124b 24-6): *ἀλλ' ἢ ὅπου τιμὴ μεγάλη ἢ ἔρως· ἐρωτικός γὰρ*

ὁ μεγάλῳ ψυχὸς τῶν εὐφῶν καὶ καλῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς· ἐφίεται δὲ καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἔργων, οἷς μεγάλη τιμὴ ἐπακολουθεῖ κτλ. Evidently he found *ἔρως* instead of, or as a variant beside, *ἔργον*.

² Contrast with Aristotle's condemnation of the Old Comedy for *αἰσχρολογία*, Marc. Aur. XI. 6, 2, who describes it as *παιδαγωγικὴν παρρησίαν ἔχουσα καὶ τῆς ἀτυφίας οὐκ ἀχρηστὸς δι' αὐτῆς τῆς εὐθυρρημοσύνης ὑπομνήσκουσα*.

Eph. v. 4 or the αἰσχρολογία of Col. iii. 8.

On this subject Cicero expresses himself in the *de Officiis* more guardedly than Aristotle, but he, too, has had to suffer interpolation in the interests of virtue. The sentences of the *de Officiis* that immediately follow the portion quoted earlier (§ 2) run:

Facilis igitur est distinctio ingenui et inliberalis joci. Alter . . . dignus, alter ne libero quidem, si rerum turpitudini adhibetur verborum obscenitas.

Whether out of respect for Aristotle or not, Cicero (or Panaetius), while condemning αἰσχρολογία, says nothing of *rerum turpitude* when divorced from obscenity of speech. But two MSS., one of which (see Miller) is of the ninth century, give *si rerum turpitude adhibetur et verborum obscenitas*. If the editors (Miller, Holden, Baiter) be right in rejecting this reading, then we may regard it as a mild instance of the same sort of interpolation as οὐδὲν for οὐ μικρόν in our MSS. of Aspasius. Its author wanted to make Cicero more moral by causing him to reject *rerum turpitude* and *verborum obscenitas* taken singly and not only in conjunction; and it is fair to observe that he could appeal, both on his own behalf and Cicero's, to *de Or.* II. § 242 (quoted by Holden), *praestet idem [orator] ingenuitatem et ruborem suum verborum turpitudine et rerum obscenitate vitanda*.

§ 5.

The tale of the vicissitudes of E.N. 8, 6 does not end here. If we turn to the commentary of Aquinas on the *Ethics*, we find that the *Antiqua* translated ὑπόνοια by *suspicio*. The real purport of the passage was thus completely obscured, and we get (Fretté et Maré, vol. xxv. p. 426) the following

explanation, in which it is to be observed that τοῖς μὲν . . . τοῖς δὲ are taken as in the Paraphrase:

Tertio ibi 'videbit autem' [ἴδοι δ' ἂν τις § 6].

Inducit quoddam signum ad supradicta quod scilicet differat ludus disciplinati et indisciplinati. Et dicit quod hoc maxime apparet considerando tam in veteribus, quam in novis comoediis, id est repraesentationibus, colloctionem hominum ad invicem. Quia si alicubi in talibus narrationibus occurreret aliquod turpiloquium, ex hoc quibusdam generabatur derisio, dum talia turpia in risum vertebantur. Quibusdam vero generabatur suspicio, dum scilicet suspicabantur eos, qui turpia loquebantur, habere aliquod malum in corde. Manifestum est autem quod non parum refert ad honestatem hominis, utrum dicat in ludendo turpia vel honesta.

It was fortunate that Aristotle's taste in jests was thus concealed. Fortunate, too, that the Vulgate did not transliterate εὐπραπελία in Eph. v. 4, but rendered it by *scurrilitas*. Otherwise, Aristotle's authority might have carried less weight when, in the *Summa*, the question had to be decided, *Utrum in ludis possit esse aliqua virtus?* and Aquinas replied, *circa ludos potest esse aliqua virtus, quam Philosophus eutrapeliam nominat*.¹ Aristotle, by making a virtue of joking, and Cicero (*i.e.*, perhaps, Panaetius) by approving *ludus* and *jocus* within limits that he indicates, must have done much to make monastic life more cheerful, despite such *dicta* as Chrysostom's, 'Not God but the devil is the giver of sport.'

C. M. MULVANY.

Queen's College,
Benares.

¹ Cf. Rickaby, *Aquinas Ethics* II. 376. It is pleasant to observe that Amasis' simile of the bow (Hdt. II. 173) had been transferred, a little altered, in *collationibus patrum* to St. John the Evangelist; unde beatus Joannes subintulit quod similiter animus hominis frangeretur si nunquam a sua intentione relaxaretur. In this *Article* are six references to Cicero, viz. one to *de Invent.* I. 17, 25, and five to *de Off.* I. §§ 103-4.

POLYBIANA.

XX. 12. 1.

THE circumstances here referred to are narrated by Plutarch (*Philop.* 15). Philopoemen had attached Sparta to the Achæan League, and in order to

secure his constant support it was decided at Sparta to offer to him the whole fortune of the late tyrant, Nabis, which had been confiscated. It amounted to 120 talents, a huge

sum, but nobody could be found to offer it to Philopoemen, as it was obviously meant as a bribe, and his integrity was well known.

Polybius writes as follows. The extract is contained in the Vatican palimpsest of the *Excerpta de Sententiis*—a MS. notoriously difficult to decipher. Heyse used chemicals to bring out the characters, with the result that the whole MS. became perfectly black, and is or was known in the Library as 'il carbone.'

The words of Polybius are as follows: ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν πλείστων ἐργολάβους πολλοὶ προσφέρουσι τὰς τοιαύτας χάριτας, καὶ ταύτην ἀρχὴν ποιοῦνται φιλίας καὶ συστάσεις, οὕτως ἐπὶ τοῦ Φιλοποίμενος ὁ προσοίσων ταύτην τὴν χάριν οὐχ εὐρίσκειτο τὸ παράπαν. The antithesis ἐπὶ τῶν πλείστων 'in the case of most people,' and ἐπὶ τῶν Φ., 'in the case of Philopoemen' is obvious. The difficult word is ἐργολάβους. I must say that ἐργολάβοι (which has been read or suggested) seems to me necessary. We can render ἐργολάβοι πολλοί, 'many enterprising schemers,' as the word had at an earlier date acquired a depreciatory sense (see the *Thesaurus*). If we adhere to ἐργολάβους it is of course in opposition with χάριτας and means 'to work for their schemes,' but this seems very forced.

The Teubner text makes nonsense of the passage. Following some German scholars, the editor gives ἀλλ' ὥσπερ <τοῖς> ἐπὶ τῶν πλείστων ἐργολάβοις <ιν>. The antithesis of οἱ πλείστοι and Φιλοποίμην is thus destroyed, and who are οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν πλ. ἐργολάβουιντες? It can only mean 'those who speculate about the largest number of people,' which, as I say, makes nonsense of the whole.

XXI. 21, 6-7 (Buttner - Wolst) = XXXII. 2 (Hultch). αἰεὶ συνέβαινε τοὺς Καρχηδόνους ἐλαττοῦσθαι παρὰ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις οὐ τοῖς δίκαιοις, ἀλλὰ τῷ πεπείσθαι τοὺς κρίνοντας συμφέρειν σφίσι τὴν τοιαύτην γνώμην· ἐπεῖτοι (ita Bekker: ἐπεὶ τοῖς MS.). χρόνοις οὐ πολλοῖς ἀνώτερον αὐτὸς ὁ Μασσανάσσας διώκων τὸν Ἀφθῆρα τὸν ἀποστάτην μετὰ στρατοπέδου δίοδον ἤτήσατο τοὺς Καρχηδονίους διὰ ταύτης τῆς χώρας, οἱ δ' οὐχ ὑπήκουσαν, ὥς

οὐδὲν αὐτῷ προσηκούσης. He then goes on to tell us that in spite of this the Romans assigned the territory to Massanissa. Now in the first place the sentence beginning with ἐπεῖτοι is a proof not of the reason why the Senate decided unjustly, but of the fact that they decided unjustly, i.e. it logically follows not on ἀλλὰ τοὺς κρίνοντας κ.τ.λ., but on οὐ τοῖς δίκαιοις, and this must be brought out in any rendering. Mr. Shuckburgh apparently adopts some other correction of ἐπεὶ τοῖς, and he renders the whole as follows: 'For instance, not many years before this Massanissa was himself at the head of an army in pursuit of Aphther, who had revolted from him, and asked permission of the Carthaginians to go through this territory, which they refused on the ground that it had nothing to do with him.' Now we ask ourselves first why we are told that Massanissa himself was leading his army. I fancy he always commanded in person. The fact is that αὐτὸς does not go with διώκων, but with ἤτήσατο. Next the Carthaginians cannot have assigned as a reason for refusing him permission to traverse the country that he had no claim to it. (This is the proper meaning of οὐδὲν αὐτῷ προσηκούσης. It is difficult to see any precise meaning in Shuckburgh's 'it had nothing to do with him.' He was evidently driven to this by the absurdity of the whole as it stands.) The very fact that Massanissa asked leave to traverse it showed that he acknowledged he had no claim to it. We must, I think, banish the words οἱ δ' οὐχ ὑπήκουσαν as an interpolation made by someone who did not understand the whole context, and substitute αὐτῷ for αὐτῶ. All is now clear and we may render a proof of their unfairness is that Massanissa himself only a few years previously, when at the head of an army in pursuit of Aphther, had asked permission to traverse the territory, thus acknowledging that he had no claim to it.

XXX. 25, 12 (Battner - Wolst) = XXXI. 3, 11 (Hultch) = *Athenaeus* V. 195a.

In the procession at Antioch, which preceded the games, there were included βόες εὐτραφεῖς περὶ χιλίους, θέρια δὲ βραχυλείπουσαι τριακοσίων.

Casaubon corrected *θεωρ'α* to *θεωρίδες*, and this has been accepted by Kaibel. I have no access to Casaubon's note, and I cannot understand what he meant by *θεωρίδες*. A ship conveying *θεωροί* was called a *θεωρίς*, and female *θεωροί* were also called so. The correction *θεωρίαί* has, of course, also been proposed, but we cannot think that members of such solemn missions would be assigned a place *behind the cattle* in the procession. I suggest that we should read *βόες εὐτραφεὶς περὶ χιλίας* (not really a change as the original MS. may have had *α*) *θεωρικαὶ δὲ βραχὺ λείπονται τριακοσίων*, 'about a thousand fattened kine and very nearly three hundred kine brought as presents by the *θεωρίαί*.' The animals, of course, were

all meant for sacrifice; and it was the custom for *θεωρίαί* sent on such occasions to bring an animal as a present to be sacrificed (see Nilsson, *Griechische Feste*, p. 409). It is probable that each *θεωρία* brought only one cow, so that there were, as a fact, nearly three-hundred *θεωρίαί* from different cities. It must have been recognised that in this case a cow was the proper victim. In an inscription (Dittenberger, *S.I.G.* 654, l. 1) the people of Asine ask for permission to send a *θεωρία* to Hermione, *καὶ συμπομπεύειν καὶ ἄγειν βοὺν*. We know from Pausanias that in this case the animal was female. This may be a mere coincidence.

W. R. PATON.

Vathy, Samos, Greece.

SOPHOCLEA.

O.T. 971 f.:

τὰ δ' οὖν παρόντα συλλαβὴν θεσπίσματα
κείται παρ' Ἀιδῶν Πόλυβος ἄξι' οὐδένομ.

The difficulty lies in the word *παρόντα*, which the earlier editors were content to understand as *quae cumque edita fuerant*. But that is either pointless if unemphatic, or puts an undue strain upon a simple word. Campbell accepts the former alternative, whereas Jebb, rightly observing that *παρόντα* must be emphatic, translates 'as they stand,' i.e. as contrasted with some far-fetched meaning which might be wormed out of them. But how can *παρόντα* imply so much? Blaydes frankly says: 'I do not see the sense of this passage'; and Nauck and Tyrrell accept F. W. Schmidt's *γέροντα* — an unsatisfactory stop-gap, which some may think slightly grotesque. I suggest the easy change to *προδόντα*, with the sense: 'But anyhow' (with δ' οὖν Oedipus returns to the main theme, neglecting the parenthesis εἴ τι . . . ἐμοῦ) 'the oracles have failed, and Polybus has swept them away into the limbo of oblivion.' For the intransitive *προδιδόναι*, 'to fail,' see Hdt. 7. 187 *προδοῦναι τὰ ρέεθρα τῶν ποταμῶν ἔστι τῶν*, which answers exactly to Soph. *Al.* 1266 f. *τοῦ θανόντος ὡς ταχεῖα τις βροτοῖς | χάρις διαρρεῖ*

καὶ προδοῦσ' ἄλίσκεται, though this has not been observed. But the passage which to my mind most strongly supports the introduction of *προδόντα* here is Aesch. *Cho.* 269 *οὗτοι προδώσει Λοξίου μεγασθενὲς χρησιός*, where also the verb is intransitive.

Ant. 471 f.:

δῆλοι τὸ γέννημ' ὦμόν ἐξ ὦμόυ πατρός
τῆς παιδός· εἰκεν δ' οὐκ ἐπίσταται κακοῖς.

All attempts to explain this passage have broken down owing to the impossibility of justifying *γέννημα* in the sense of 'disposition' (Campbell, *Paralipomena*, p. 16, escapes by way of the equivocal 'breeding'). And yet that is what the context seems imperatively to require. The purpose of this note is to call attention to some external evidence which is generally ignored, although no solution can be satisfactory which does not account for it. I refer to the gloss in A *φώνην* (leg. *φώνημ*) and to the γρ. τὸ *φώνημα* of Ven. 467. Meaningless of course; but I have no doubt that *φώνημα* was a blunder for *φρόνημα*, as is indicated by the τὸ *σκληρὸν αὐτῆς τοῦ φρονήματος* of Σ and the constant confusion of the derivatives of *φρον-* and *φων-*. Out of many examples see the apparatus for *Al.* 1230 and O.T. 324. The confusion may have

been assisted by the use of the symbol ϕ . The next question is: Why was the gloss introduced? As against the possibility that it was attached to *γέννημα* we must bear in mind that Hesychius interprets *γέννημα* with *παίδιον*, whereas *φρόνημα* is the almost invariable gloss on *λήμα*, as may be seen in Hesych. Phot. Suid. s.v., schol. Ar. *Ran.* 494 *λήμά ἐστι τὸ φρόνημα*. For its suitability see Wilamowitz on Eur. *Her.* 1416 and Kaibel on Soph. *El.* 1424. Viewed in this light, the attempts of Blaydes and Semitelos to introduce *λήμα* into the text are seen to be not without reason. The best of these is Blaydes's *τὸ γούν λήμ'*. The hyperbaton of *τῆς παιδός* should not cause any trouble: many similar examples in Sophocles and the other tragedians, due to the conflicting claims of metre and emphasis, may be found in the Index to my edition of the *Fragments of Sophocles*. But I desire to call attention here to the prevalence of this habit for the purpose of interpreting *El.* 1296 *οὕτω δ' ὅπως μήτηρ σε μὴ 'πιγνώσεται | φαιδρῷ προσώπῳ νῶν ἐπελθόντοιν δόμους*. It is generally supposed that *οὕτω* qualifies *σκόπει* to be supplied *per ellipsin*. An ellipse of course there is; but to justify *οὕτω* as an adverbial qualification of the suppressed verbal notion we need some other evidence than Ar. *Ran.* 905, which proves nothing of the kind. I suggest that *οὕτω* really qualifies *φαιδρῷ*, for which it prepares the way. It is thus suitably deictic, and betrays the eagerness and anxiety of Orestes as he turns to Electra and observes that her bright looks may betray him to his enemies. 'But there—beware lest when we are within,' etc.

Ai. 1244:

ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἡμᾶς ἢ κακοῖς βαλεῖτέ που
ἢ σὺν δόλῳ κεντήσεθ' οἱ λελειμμένοι.

Here my concern is with *λελειμμένοι*, for I am not satisfied that it can bear the meaning which is assigned to it by the schol. (*οἱ ἡττηθέντες ἐν τῇ δίκῃ*) and most of the editors. That is no doubt the meaning required; but *λείπεσθαι* has no juristic associations, and I can find no passage where it is used absolutely as 'to be worsted' or 'defeated,' not even Polyb. i. 62. 6, where it is rather 'to give in' or 'fall short.' It might well signify 'not to put in an appearance,' as it probably does in Aesch. fr. 37 (cf. Eur. *Heracl.* 722). But neither the meaning 'to fall short'—since we cannot supply the appropriate standard (*τῶν Ἀχιλλείων ὅπλων*)—nor 'to be outstripped in the race,' even when supported by Campbell's extraordinary recommendation that 'it adds point to the suggestion of wounding from behind,' is suitable to the context. The alternative of Ellendt that *οἱ λελειμμένοι* means 'those whom Ajax left behind' has met with little favour, and deserves none. Now it is a remarkable fact that the change of *ει* to *η* (for the confusion see Aesch. *Pers.* 344) gives us a word, *λελημμένοι*, capable of exactly that interpretation which the schol. advocates. It is perhaps unnecessary to quote examples from the Orators of *εἰληφθαι* as 'to be found out'—of those whose crimes have been laid bare; but it should be pointed out that it has a more general sense in Dem. 9. 17 *ὁ γὰρ οἷς ἂν ἐγὼ ληφθείην, ταῦτα πράττων καὶ κατασκευαζόμενος, οὗτος ἐμοὶ πολεμεῖ*. For the form see Soph. fr. 750.

A. C. PEARSON.

TERENTIANA.

(Continued from C.R. XXXII. 99-102.)

IN my former paper the metrical treatment of two types of interrogative sentence was considered, and a canon established that (A) any case of *hic* subjoined to *quis* or *quid* is necessarily shortened, and (B) in the phrase *quid est quod, est* is necessarily shortened.

(A) Twenty-two examples were given

of this. To them there fall to be added the following:

And. 112 quid hīc mihi.

„ 311 quid hīc agit?

Haut. 935 quid hīc quod rogo.

„ 1000 quid hīc autem?

Eun. 87 quid hīc stabas? (*hic* locative).

„ 671 quid hīc tibi reditio?

„ 1028 quid hīc autemst mali?

Eun. 1034 quid hic laetus est?
Phor. 177 sed quid hoc est?
 " 991 quis hic homost?
Hec. 198 quod hoc genus.
 " *ib.* quae hæc est?
 " 672 quae hæc amentias?
Ad. 149 quam hic non amavit . . .
 " 555 quae hæc est miseria?

and

And. 708 PA. ego hanc uisam. DA. Quo tu?
 Quo hinc te agis? PA. Verum uis
 dicam? DA. immo etiam.

The total now comes to thirty-eight, or bating the last five on the list (the scansion of which involves a question of elision or non-elision, to be discussed anon) thirty-three unquestioned.

Of refractory instances, two were disposed of in the former paper: to these must be added four more, which I had neglected. I submit that the mere ratio makes an overwhelming probability in favour of supposing that the exceptions are corruptions.

(α) *Phor.* 743:

So. Quid? non, obsecro, es
 quem semper te esse dictitasti? CH. St!
 So. Quid has metuis fores?

According to our canon this *has* should be short; but the case does not call for fire and steel: a mere change of punctuation will mend it. Sostrata's question is not 'Why are you afraid of this door?' but 'What? Are you afraid of this door?' Read it: *Quid? Has metuis fores?* and the pause will protect the quantity of *has* from being shortened by the *quid*.

(β) *Phor.* 792:

NAU. Quid hæc uidentur? DE. Scilicet.
 NAU. Virum me natam uellem!

This verse is admittedly obscure. The words *quid hæc uidentur?* are usually taken in the sense of *qualia hæc uidentur?* or *quid tibi de his uidetur?* In any case it seems to me that the *hui!* from the end of the preceding line should be brought to the beginning of this. So much would satisfy the canon. But would not the words *Hui! Quid hæc uidentur?* (for *uidentur*) give better meaning? They should be assigned to Demipho. 'Whew! What do you think of *her*?'¹ In which case the following *scilicet* belongs to Nausistrata,

¹ For this phrase cf. *Quis uideor?* in *And.* 702.

whose *uirum me natam uellem* is the simplest commentary on Demipho's question.

(γ) *Ad.* 485-6:

DEM. Pudet: nec quid agam nec quid huic
 respondeam

Scio. PAM. Miseram me, differor doloribus!

This is a more difficult case. *Nec quid huic* is a flagrant violation. But, if the cure is less obvious than the last two, there are some peculiarities in the tradition which heighten the suspicion of disease: in the MSS.² F and P (Ambros. and Paris. both saec. X.) *scio* appears subjoined to *respondeam* at the end of v. 485; and in DGBC for *miseram* we have *intus miseram*. This *intus* the majority of editors have taken for a stage direction intruded into the text. But the metrical enormity of *quid huic* has been hitherto neglected. When it is reckoned among the factors in the problem, I am inclined to agree with Fleckeisen in taking *intus* into the text (the sense is unobjectionable: τὰ ἐντοσθεν διασπαράττομαι) and to read:

DEM. Pudet: nec quid agam sciō nec quid
 huic respondeam.

PAM. intus, miseram me, differor doloribus!

(δ) Here again we are concerned with the question, 'Can a pause be overridden and the intensity of the interrogative still take effect?'

And. 201:

St. Quid? Hōc intellexti? An nondum
 etiam ne hoc quidem? DA. Immo callide.

Preferable on all grounds, I think, to read,

Quid? hōcin intellexti? An nondum etiam . . .

for the emphasis on the pronoun is such that *hocin*, not *hoc*, seems requisite. Regularly, after *quid* as a separate, introductory interrogative, the next word should have the particle *-ne* attached. Once the *in* had been lost by haplography, the metrical flaw being undetected, *ne* was wrongly added to *intellexti*. One good MS., the Decurtatus (G), omits it.

(B) To the section in which the prosody of *quid-est-quod* was treated, the following is a supplement:

² MSS. are cited according to Umpfenbach throughout.

And. 45:

quin tu uno uerbo dic *quid est quod* me uelis?

This *quid est quod* will not do. But the words as quoted by Donatus on *Ad.* 952 offer a solution. There the line runs:

quin tu uno uerbo dic *si quid est quod* me uelis.

This will not scan; but combine it with the fact that in cod. C (Oxonensis) *dic* is omitted, and we get the reading:

quin tu uno uerbo, *si quid est quod* me uelis.

dic should be understood, not expressed: *quid*, no longer interrogative, no longer affects the quantity of *est*.

These two others are perfectly regular:

Haut. 901 *quid est quod* amplius simuletur . . .

„ 1008 at si rogem iam *quid est quod* peccem . . .

It should be noted in addition that in *quid est obsecro*? there is no pause: the shortening of *est* is therefore normal. But there is nothing to justify the printing of *Haut.* 616 (in Umpfenbach, etc.):

So. Quid est? Isne tibi uidetur? CA. Dixi equidem, ubi mi ostendisti, ilico.

The *est* is illegitimate before the pause. It should be:

So. Quid est? i'n tibi uidetur . . .

One remains outstanding:

Phor. 411:

PH. Hahahae! homo suavis! DE. Quid est? Num iniquom postulo?

I see no remedy but Bentley's, the excision of *est* 'versus gratia': read *quid? num iniquom postulo*? Even Horace allowed this hiatus:

coccto num adest honor idem? (*Sat.* II. ii. 28).

and in Terence cf. *Eun.* 1060.

Dziatzko-Hauler⁴ (1913) rejects Bentley's (and Baumann's) correction, quoting a number of passages, none of which is relevant to the question whether the intensity of *quid* can exercise its weakening effect on the quantity of *est*, notwithstanding the full pause.

Ad. 261 is a similar problem:

Sv. Quid est? Ct. Quid sit?

is an inadmissible scansion. I suggest:

Sv. Quid est? Ct. Quid? Illius opera, Syre, nunc uiuo . . .

If so, this makes another case falling to be added to the list of *quid—ille*.

It seems *prima facie* improbable that such extremely common colloquial combinations as this *quis hoc*, etc., had not an established pronunciation to which the rigid convention of 'position' must give way. More evidence will be offered anon when we come to consider other similar phrases. But it may already be claimed with confidence that the few exceptions, curable in every case by easy remedies, are due to the ignorance of this principle, among others, of Terentian prosody which obtained as early as the fifth century.

Considering then that we have here a certitude for point of departure, and are authorised in saying that uniformly, according to the practice of the spoken language of Terence's day, the intensity of *quis* reduces any case of *hic* combined with it to the value of an enclitic, and shortens a subjoined *est quod*, we can proceed to extend the inquiry. Let us next inspect what pronouns, or other words, in combination with *quis* are correspondingly affected. I will first tabulate Terence's usage of *quis—ille*, *quis—illic*, *quis—iste*, *quis—istic*, *quis—id*, *quis—ipse*. The resulting canon will be simple: any of these pronouns subjoined to *quis* or *quid* is shortened in the first syllable, the intensity of the interrogative reducing that syllable and overruling position.

The annexed list exhibits specimens of them all:

And. 745 DAV. Apud forum quid turbaest! *Quid illic* hominum litigant!

„ 934 SI. *Quid id* credis? CH. Phania illic frater meus fuit. SI. Noram et scio.

Haut. 192 CH. Quid narrat? CL. *Quid ille*? se miserum esse. CH. Miserum? quem minus credere est?

„ 310 CL. Agedum uicissim, Syre, dic *quae illa* est altera?

„ 317 CL. *Quid illo* facias? SV. At enim. . . . CL. Quid enim?

SV. Si sinas, dicam. CLIN. Sine.

„ 579 SV. *Quid iste* narrat? CL. Perii! SV. Clitipho, haec ego praecipio tibi?

„ 973 SV. Ere, licetne? CH. loquere. SV. at tuto? CH. loquere! SV. *Quae istast* prauitas?

¹ „ 530 CH. hominem pistrino dignum! SV. *Quem istunc*? CH. Seruolum dico adulescentis.

⁴ *Vulg.* SV. Quem? CH. Istunc seruolum. But Syrus asks, 'Whom do you mean by that?' which is *Quem istunc*?

- Phor.* 477 AN. *Quid is fecit?* GE. Confutauit uerbis admodum iratum senem.
 " 572 CH. Ad me profectam esse aibant. DE. *Quid illi* tam diu.
Hec. 588 SO. quin tua Philumena ad te redeat. PA. quae so, *quid istuc* consilist?
Ad. 84 MI. Quid fecit? DE. *Quid ille* fecerit quem neque pudet.
 " 656 ANT. *Quid ipsae?* Quid aiunt? MI. *Quid illas* censes? nil enim.
 " 438 DE. Sed *quis illic* est quem uideo procul? Estne Hegio?
 " 677 MI. Cui ueneram aduocatus? Sed *quid ista*, Aeschine.

In detail, these are the examples of *quid*, *quid—ille*, *illic*:

- And.* 237, 745, 843, 853, 937, 963.
Haut. 591, 655, 882.
Eun. 417, 419, 431, 547, 833, 837, 1015.
Phor. 183,¹ 184, 572, 755, 811.
Ad. 556, 656, 662, 665.

That is is to say, twenty-five examples, against which there are only two abnormal instances:

(a) *Phor.* 811:

uin satis quaesitum mi istuc esse? Age, fiat. amici nostri quid futurumst?
Quid? illa filia

So read, it is questionable if the pause after *quid* allow *illa*. It is only a matter of punctuation:

quid illa? Filiā
 amici nostri quid futurumst?

'What about *her*? What's to become of our friend's daughter?' The sentence is improved. For the idiomatic ellipse of the verb and for the double question cf. *Eun.* 417, *Ad.* 656, etc.:

(b) *Ad.* 702:

MI. Quid? quam illam? AE. Aequae. MI. Perbenigne! AE. *Quid? ille* ubist Milesius?

The same treatment fits this case as the last. Read:

Quid ille? Ubist Milesius?

'What about *him*? Where's the Milesian?

Next, the combination *quid istuc*:

- And.* 645, 651, 721, 941.
Haut. 82, 251, 562, 910,² 985, 1053.
Eun. 237, 650, 652, 947.
Phor. 58, 156, 257, 343, 503, 800, 816, 990.
Hec. 588, 743, 874.
Ad. 210, 324, 465, 622, 984.

That is to say, thirty normal examples, against which only two exceptions:

¹ To be read as a troch. dim. catal. like *v.* 191.

² Needlessly mispunctuated in Umpfenbach.

(a) *Eun.* 656:

DOR. Au! obsecro, mea Pythias { *quid istuc* nam monstri C¹DEFGP(?).
 quod istuc nam monstri BC²P(?).
 quod istuc nam monstrum A. } fuit.
 (corr. rec. altered *quod* to *quid*.)

think we are justified in calling either *quid istuc* or *quod istuc* an impossibility, and emending to:

quid istuc? Numnam monstrum fuit?

'What do you mean? Surely not something uncanny? i.e. against Nature.

b *Ad.* 956:

MI. Quid istuc? Dabitur quandoquidem hic uo DE. Gaudeo.

The line has been variously emended. For my present purpose it is enough to say that the text is in such a state that it cannot be objected as a valid instance against the overwhelming consensus of passages cited above, and therefore to claim that *quid istuc* is the only prosody known to Terence.

Next the instances of the 'formula aegre concedentis' *quid istic*?

- And.* 572, 849.
Haut. 1053.
Eun. 171, 388.
Hec. —.
Phor. —.
Ad. 133, 350.

No exception.

Next the instances of *quid—iste* or *istic* in combination other than these last:

- And.* 849, 941.
Haut. 380.
Eun. 121, 705, 1089.
Phor. 995.
Hec. —.
Ad. 388, 644, 677.

Among these are two more cases in which a mere repunctuation solves the apparent difficulty of a disregarded pause.

In *Eun.* 1089 read:

THRAS. Quid isti? GN. Te ignorabant: postquam eis mores ostendi tuos. . . .

Thrasso asks, 'What's up? What do they say?' (It is more natural for him to designate them as *isti* before approaching them, than for Gnatho to call them so, standing beside them. For the idiomatic ellipsis of *aiunt* cf. *Eun.* 417, *Ad.* 656, etc., quoted above.)

In *Ad.* 388:

SYR. . . non quod ante pedes modost
Videre sed etiam illa quæ futura sunt
Prospicere. DEM. Quid istaec? iam penes uos
psaltriast?

(All the editors punctuate *Quid?*
istaec iam penes uos psaltriast? But the
double question is more characteristic,
and the sense more pointed: 'What
about that female? Is the chorus girl
already a member of the family?')

These regulated, there remain ten
examples, no exceptions.

Next of *quid—ipse*. There is only
one example:

Ad. 656 *Quid ipsae?* Quid aiunt?

And, to complete the pronouns, of
quid—is there are three examples in
Phormio, viz.:

477 *Quid is* fecit?

(which can of course be accounted for
otherwise.)

Ib. 185 Quod cum audierit, quod eius réme-
dium inueniam iracundiae?

[Dziatzko-Hauler⁴ (1913) is prepared
to scan this verse as an iambic octo-
narius! *Aurem interroga!* as Probus
Valerius said.]

Ib. 940 PH. etiam dotatis soleo. CH. *Quid*
id nostra? PH. Nihil.

No exceptions.

In conclusion to this part, it will be
proper to glance at the question which
occurs when the combination of in-
terrogative and demonstrative gives rise
to hiatus: e.g. *quæ illaec* or *qui istuc*?
What is the fact in pronunciation—
synaloepha or shortening of the long
vowel (or diphthong) in hiatus?

Of the latter event one can cite the
following cases, according to the vowels
brought into conflict:

ae—a:

Ad. 680 quæ agis.

e—a:

Phor. 419 nê agas.

Ad. 610 tē amo.

" 903 tē amat.

em—e:

Eun. 1060 quēm ego hic.

i—a:

Phor. 27 quī aget.

" 383 quī ais.

Hec. 343 quī amat.

And. 191 quī amant (cf. Virg. *Ecl.* VIII.
109, and the invariable *ita-me-di-*
ament or *amabunt*).

i—e:

Haut. 537 quī eros.

" 966 quī erat.

Phor. 911 quī erit.

uoi—o:

Hec. 343 quōi odio.

o—a:

Hec. 495, 496; *Phor.* 216; *Ad.* 780 quō
abis.

u—a:

Ad. 920 tū ais.

Since we know that interrogative
intensity invariably reduces the quantity
of any subjoined case of *hic, ille, iste*,
etc., can we suppose that this intensity
varied according to the vowel of the
inflection? Or that, the intensity re-
maining constant, the reaction of the
conflicting vowel altered the fact-of-
speech which results? Was the weak
î prodelided, or were two distinct short
syllables heard?

I have not much doubt that in

Eun. 662 *quo ille* abire ignauos possit longius,
or in

Phor. 191 *quam hic* fugam aut furtum parat?

the first foot is a tribrach and not a
trochee.

But the following cases remain in
question:

Haut. 310 Syre, dic, *quæ illast* altera?

Eun. 947 *quæ illaec* turbast?

Hec. 95 *quæ illi* placerent (rel. not interrog.,
but see later).

Ad. 985 *quæ illaec* subitast largitas?

Phor. 123 qui illum di omnes perduint!

Haut. 708 nam *qui ille* poterit esse in tuto?

" 562 *qui istic* mos est, Clitipho?

" 612; *Eun.* 121, 657; *Phor.* 330, 855;
Hec. 103 (six instances of) *qui*
istuc?

Ubi? has naturally the same in-
tensity as *quis?* and exercises the same
effect; but the examples are less fre-
quent:

And. 607 *ubi illic* est, scelus, qui me hodie . . .

" 742 CHR. Puer herclest! Mulier, tu
adposisti hunc? MYS. *Ubi illic*
est?

Eun. 643 *Ubi illum* ego scelerosum misera
atque impium inueniam aut ubi
quaeram?

Phor. 749 *Ubi illa* sunt? SO. Miseram me!
CH. Hém, quid ést? uiuóntne?
SO. Ufuit gnáta.

- Ad.* 265 *Ūbi illeſt ſacrilegus?* SAN. Men
quaerit? Numquidnam ecſert?
occidi!
ubi illeſt F.
ubi eſt ille *ceteri*.
" 569 Sed eſtne frater intus? SY. Non
eſt. DE. *ubi illum* inueniam
cogito.

One doubtful case is

- Phor.* 727 DE. Rogabo. CH. *ubi illas* nunc
ego reperire poſſim cogito.

but BCFGF unite in the reading

ubi ego illas,

which is normal.

Before taking leave of the interrogatives, it is worth while to record a few sporadic examples where their intensity is exercised not on a pronoun, but on some other word or group of words:

- Eun.* 233 *quid* interest.
" 290 miror *quid* & Piræo abierit, nam ſibi
cuſtos publice eſt nunc.
" 573 pro eunuchon? CH. Sic eſt. AN.
Quid ex-ea-re. . . .

(*ex-ea-re, ob-eam-rem, in-ea-re*, etc.,
are recognised groups.)

- " 777 *quid* ignaue? Peniculon pugnare. . .
Haut. 932 *Quot* incommoditates hac re accipies,
niſi caues!
Hec. 157 *quid* interea? Ibatne ad Bacchi-
dem?

(To be punctuated so: the *ne* indicates it.)

We may infer, then, that there were in the Latin of Terence's time a class of *intense* words and a correlative class of weak words, not precisely enclitic, because, unlike enclitics which attach parasitically to any preceding word, the weakness of these is shown by their setting in motion the process called the Iambic Law ('Breves Breviantes') whenever they adjoin an intense word.

Not strictly enclitic, neither do they form regular word-groups. A proper word-group is constituted when certain words, by constant collocation to express a composite idea, become slurred and the intervals between them in pronunciation suppressed. Such a group

is pronounced and accented as a single polysyllabic word:¹ e.g.

*animindūco, fidēdo, quamobrem, ineare, ita-
me-dī-ament, ita-mē-dī-amābunt, in-malām-
rem, dī uestrām fidem!*

etc.

We have to deal with *pairs* rather than groups regularly collocated together; the intense word *dominates*, the weak word *recedes*—to borrow the Mendelian terms:

- Phor.* 566 *qua uſa iſtuc facies?* Dicam in
itinere: modo te hinc amoue.

uia has no effect on *iſtuc*, but as soon as ever *iſtuc* finds itself adjoining *quis*, *quid*, its first syllable automatically weakens, and we have *quis iſtuc*, *quid iſtuc*.

An actor knew what rhythm to start his verse upon from the outset. It was an impossible violation of the spoken pronunciation to make it

qua uſa iſtuc facies?

Having thus by exhaustive analysis acquired certain specimens of these combinations, we can extend our knowledge by further observation. What other words, known to have intensity, can be shown to exercise the same dominant effect on these recessive pronouns, *hic*, *ille*, *iste*, etc.?

Those which obviously suggest themselves are the personal pronouns *ego* and *tu*. We know that these are only expressed when emphatic, otherwise the inflexion of the verb is sufficient to indicate the person. We shall expect then to find *ego hānc*, *tū iſtunc*, etc.

The next step will be to see if Terentian practice confirms this hypothesis.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

Glasgow,
January, 1920.

¹ 'In compositis dictionibus unus accentus est non minus quam in una parte orationis ut *malesanus interealoci*,' Diomed. Keil 1, p. 433, [Prisc.] *de Accent.* Keil 3, p. 520; cf. Priscian viii. 88, Keil 2, p. 440, *magisterequitum*. It is enough to refer to Professor Lindsay's writings on the subject.

NOTES

SAPPHO'S NEREÏD-ODE.

THE article on this subject by Mr. J. M. Edmonds on pp. 4-6 of the present volume led me to look at the papyrus (*Brit. Mus. Pap.* 739) with a view to checking the new readings which he gives; and since, though I can claim no authority in the decipherment of literary texts, two opinions are always better than one, it is perhaps worth while to record the results of my examination. This might not have been the case indeed had I agreed with all Mr. Edmonds' readings; but as in one point at least I differ from him very decidedly it seems better to call attention to the fact at once, lest discussion of the question should be started on a wrong track. I give below my conclusions, line by line:

1. 2. *δότε* may certainly be read; as Mr. Edmonds says, a small trace of the *o* and a larger trace of the accent are visible.
1. 5. Mr. Edmonds is certainly right in now preferring *οσθ* to *ασθ*.
1. 9. *ε' ελοι* seems likely to be right. There is a trace of ink which I consider quite inconsistent with *θ*, and which suggests *κ*, *λ*, or possibly *δ*.
1. 13. This is the point in which I differ most decisively from Mr. Edmonds. He thinks that 'the traces suit *ισ*.' If the letter were *σ* the line of ink should be curved; to me it seems perfectly straight and quite unlike the bottom of any *σ* in the papyrus. Among consonants *μ* (probably not *ν*) or *π*, among vowels *η* or *ι*, are most obviously suggested.
- χω*. Mr. Edmonds is right in saying that the bottom of the supposed *iota* adscript is not to be found, but it is, I think, quite possible that the surface of the papyrus is slightly rubbed here (some of the ink has disappeared from the bottom of *ω*), so that it is hardly necessary to credit the scribe with an erroneous punctuation mark.
1. 18. *χη* is perhaps possible; two traces of ink before the supposed *η* might at need be taken as the top ends of the two strokes of *χ*; but they are

rather closer together, and the second closer to *η* than one would expect, and a greater objection is that the second, under a glass, appears too straight for part of *χ*. I therefore much prefer *ρη*; the trace before *η*, which goes, apparently, straight up, and then turns down to the right, suits *ρ* excellently.

1. 19. Mr. Edmonds reads *κακάν*], but the mark over *a* is horizontal (*ā*), and though the accent sometimes approaches the horizontal it never elsewhere reaches it. Hence a mark of quantity seems likelier here than an accent.
1. 20. I agree with Mr. Edmonds in thinking *η* likelier than *ι*; indeed I seemed to see traces of the stroke connecting the two uprights.

H. IDRIS BELI..

British Museum.

EURIPIDES, *HERACLES* 725.

δεῦρ' ἔπεσθε, πρόσπολοι,
ὡς ἂν σχολὴν λύσωμεν ἄσμενοι πόνων.

λύσωμεν σχολὴν πόνων is idiomatic Greek for λύσωμεν πόνους ὥστε σχολὴν ἔχειν; cf. *Andromache* (121), ἄκος τῶν δυσλύτων πόνων τεμείν. Byrde, in his recent edition of the play, says 'σχολή πόνων must surely mean "rest from our toils," and we should then read *λεύσωμεν*.' This is Canter's emendation; but it is unnecessary, as the brachylogy of λύσωμεν is most appropriate in an expression of impatience.

R. B. APPLETON.

PLATO, *THEAETETUS* 188B.

καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τῷ μῆτε Θεαίτητον μῆτε Σωκράτη
εἰδοτι εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν λαβεῖν ὡς κτλ.

Jowett: 'For example, he knows neither T. nor S. and yet he fancies that . . .' *Geddes* has no note. Those who are puzzled by the text, and even more by the translation, may be disposed to consider the following suggestion:

καὶ <ταὐτὸ> τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τῷ μῆτε Θ. μῆτε Σ. εἰδοτά κτλ.

If ταῦτό dropped out, the construction would naturally be misunderstood (the wonder is that it ever was supposed to be understood), and a correction of εἰδότα to εἰδóτι followed.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

ἔσται δὲ καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν Αἰγέως στρατῷ
αἰεὶ δ' ἐκάστων τοῦτο βουλευτήριον

(Aesch. *Eumenides* 684.)

is the MSS. reading of the third and fourth lines of Athena's final speech to the jury, before they give their vote, in Aeschylus' *Eumenides*.

The reading δ' ἐκάστων is impossible, and the emendation, δικαστῶν, which is generally accepted, is unsound, in the first place, because the change from ε to ι is very unlikely, and, in the second, because the apostrophe in δ' ἐκάστων, which appears in M, is not accounted for.

Verrall's emendation, δεκάστων, involves the second objection, as well as being a word invented for the occasion. On the other hand, his surmise that there were ten jurymen seems quite right, especially as while the voting is taking place there are ten couplets spoken.

Cf. Sidgwick, *Eumenides*' Introduction (p. 22), where he says that because twelve couplets are spoken by the chorus at Agamemnon's death, we may take it as a strong proof that there were twelve members of the chorus. He then adds, wrongly as I think, 'we may assume it was the same number in the *Eumenides*.' Now, if the fact that there are twelve couplets in one play proves that the chorus of that play numbered twelve, surely there being ten couplets in another play will prove that there were ten members of the chorus, especially as in each play the couplets occurred at the most critical period. Verrall, apart from this, has put forward a very strong case for ten jurymen. Therefore I suggest that δέκ' ἀστῶν be read, the lines running as follows:

ἔσται δὲ καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν Αἰγέως στρατῷ
αἰεὶ δέκ' ἀστῶν τοῦτο βουλευτήριον.

This reading, while in no way altering the sense, needs no change of letters, and also explains the apostrophe in δ' ἐκάστων, and I should imagine that,

while copying, anyone could make a mistake of putting an apostrophe two letters too soon.

CEDRIC M. RAPHAEL.

St. John's College,
Oxford.

THE MEANING OF ΚΡΙΣΙΣ AS A MEDICAL TERM.

Κρίσις is perhaps the most common and important of Greek medical terms, and is in frequent use in most modern languages; yet there seems some doubt as to its meaning. Thus, Dr. A. J. Brock, in his translation of Galen on the *Natural Faculties* (Loeb Library), renders κρίνειν τὰ νοσήματα (p. 60) 'expels disease by crises,' and explains in a note that κρίσις = elimination, as though short for ἑκκρίσις, a view supported by other scholars. It is, however, contrary to all medical tradition. Galen observes that Hippocrates in the genuine *Epidemics* I. and III. οὐχ ἅπαξ οὐδὲ δις, ἀλλὰ πᾶν πολλάκις τὴν λύσιν μόνην τοῦ νοσήματος ὀνομάζει κρίσιν, οὐδεμιᾶς οὐτ' ἑκκρίσεως οὐτ' ἀποστάσεως σαφῶς προγεγεννημένης (*Crit. Diet.* 2-5. 9. 864 K) (9. 864 Kühn's edition). The clearest definition in the *Corpus Hippocraticum* occurs in *Affect.* § 8 κρίνεσθαι δὲ ἔστιν ἐν τῇσι νούσοισιν, ὅταν αὖξυνται αἱ νοῦσοι, ἢ μαραίνωνται, ἢ μεταπίπτωσιν ἐς ἕτερον νόσημα, ἢ τελευτώσιν (6. 216 L).

It is obvious that κρίσις and κρίνω must here have a sense quite distinct from 'elimination,' and Galen has no doubt what it is. He tells us Ἡ κατὰ τὰ νοσήματα κρίσις ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις μετενέγκται σημαίνουσα τὴν ὀξύρροπον ἐν νόσῳ μεταβολήν (in *Hipp. Prog.* 3-6. 18, 231). Stephanus of Athens, in his scholia, puts it in dramatic form:

Τί ἐστι κρίσις; κρίσις ἐστὶν ὀξύρροπος καὶ ἄθροια ἐν νόσῳ μεταβολή. Πόθεν ὀνόμασται κρίσις; ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ κρινόμενων. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖσε ὁ καταδικαζόμενος ἐν μέσῳ ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου ἐστίν, οὕτως ἰδὼν τις νοσοῦντα καὶ ἐν δυσφορίᾳ διάγοντα ἔφη, ἐλέησον, οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος κρίνεται μετὰ ζῶντος καὶ θανάτου.

A crisis, then, though usually pre-

ceded or accompanied by an elimination or 'abscession' refers to the determination of the disease as by a judicial verdict. This is also the view adopted by Latin writers from Celsus downwards. He says (3. 4) certain days were called *κρίσιμοι* because on them 'tanquam de aegris judicaretur.'

Dr. Brock would perhaps have done well to have ignored his classical advisers and stuck to the medical tradition, rendering either 'determines the crises of diseases' as Daremberg, or 'brings diseases to a decisive issue.'

E. WITHINGTON.

AN INTERPRETATION OF HORACE ODES III. 3.

In the winter following the battle of Actium, Octavius was at Samos when tidings arrived that the legions in Italy were getting out of control. Setting out at once, and secretly, we may suppose, he took ship for Brundisium and was twice almost shipwrecked, once just north of the Peloponnesus, then again opposite the Ceraunian cliffs. In each storm part of the escorting squadron was sunk and his own ship was terribly shattered, losing both rigging and rudder.¹ Nothing daunted by this alarming experience, having quickly overawed the soldiers and settled their claims, he put out to sea once more, although it was the dead of winter, and succeeded in reaching his base with such celerity that the news of his departure and his return arrived in Egypt at the same moment. It is to these exploits that Horace seems to refer in our ode, particularly in the second stanza:

Iustum et tenacem propositi virum
Non civium ardor prava iubentium,
Non vultus instantis tyranni
Mente quatit solida, neque Auster

Dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae,
Nec fulminantis magna manus Iovis;
Si fractus inlabatur orbis
Impavidum ferient ruinae.

This leads us to the inference that the *instans tyrannus* is none other than Antony himself, whose strength was alarming even in Italy. The fear of his

designs is well expressed in the third poem of Virgil's *Catalepton*, which contains the line

Hic grave servitium tibi iam, tibi, Roma, ferebat.²

The *civium ardor prava iubentium* may be referred to the bold stand taken by Sosius and others in favour of Antony and the equally bold resistance of Octavianus in a famous meeting of the Senate.³ It thus appears that Horace is glancing at events from the year preceding Actium down to the return of Octavianus and the settlement of affairs in 27. The title of Augustus was conferred in January of this year, and paeans of victory and congratulation would be in order.

It also becomes manifest, with this interpretation, why Hercules should be mentioned. Octavianus, for the first time in his public career, proved himself a daring traveller, spending no less than two years away from Italy engaged in arduous labours for the good of mankind. Moreover, since dangerous voyages were undertaken at the most forbidding season, it is appropriate to mention Pollux also, who connotes his brother, gods of the sea, gleaming stars. Augustus reclining in the company of these heroes and sipping the purple nectar affords suggestion of Bacchus, who with his yoked tigers serves for a transition to the chariot of Mars and to Quirinus.

We now come, in the speech of Juno, to a problem that must sorely have puzzled the Augustans whenever they endeavoured to acclimatise the story of Aeneas and his settlement in Italy. The legend implied, of course, the identification of the Greek Hera with the Roman Juno, but how could that spiteful goddess, the implacable enemy of the Aeneadae, ever be transformed into the benevolent Juno, endeared by such epithets as *Lucina*, *Regina*, and *Sospita*, the intimate deity of every woman, the protectress of Rome? On what occasion in history did she lay aside her hostility? Horace and Virgil offer different but similar solutions of the difficulty. The former represents the conversion of the goddess as taking

¹ Suetonius *Vita*, 17; Dio. 51, 4.

NO. CCLXXVII. VOL. XXXIV.

² See *A.J.P.*

³ Dio. 50, 2.

place at the death of Romulus, or before it, when she consents to his assumption into the heavens upon condition that no attempt shall be made to rebuild the fallen Troy.

While there may be in this some reference to a project often thought of by the Romans, it is also possible that we have rather an ethical innuendo, a moral drawn from the fate of Antony, the terrible power for evil of an Oriental court, the spiritual insecurity of tyranny. East is East and West is West, and the two cannot be mingled. Juno is therefore only uttering the sound political judgment of the Italian mind enlightened by costly experience. Yet the moment is happily chosen for simulating the needed reconciliation of Juno. The Hellenic rulers of Egypt, the modern Argives, have assailed the modern Trojans, the disguised Aeneadae, and have been for once and all repulsed. What can the queen of heaven do but gracefully admit the modern Romulus and become a benevolent Juno? Such is the *natural* implication of the ode.

Virgil, who faced the same difficulty at a later date, chooses the moment before the death of Turnus for the reconciliation (XII. 791 ff.), and there is a marked similarity of treatment. Juno is reminded that Aeneas is to become a deity under the title *Aeneas indiges*, and to this she tacitly consents, just as she assented to the assumption of Romulus, but she again makes stipulations. These are the preservation of the Latin name, the Latin tongue, and the Latin dress, trifling matters, it might appear, compared with the imposing demands of Juno in the ode of Horace. Yet Virgil could not overlook the plain contradictions of the Aeneas legend, the continuity of Latin speech, the ancient glory of the Latin name, and the distinctive Roman dress. These obstacles

to the credibility of the Trojan immigration he must explain away, and he must eliminate the resistance of Juno before the death of Turnus. The gods must abandon the failing cause. These necessities afford the motives for that last conference of Jupiter and Juno. It is thereby made perfectly plain that the Oriental brought nothing to Italy but his gods. The honours are divided. The heart of the race, its garb, tongue, and name, are conceded to be Italic:

Sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago.

NORMAN W. DE WITT.

Victoria College,
Toronto.

MARTIAL II. XIV. I.

nil *intemptatum* Selius, nil linquit *inausum*.

CAN Martial have possessed a text of the Eighth *Aeneid*, which on (VIII. 205, 206)

at furiis Caci mens, ne quid *inausum*
aut *intractatum* scelerisve dolivi fuisset

had the reading of the second hand of the Medicean *intemptatum*?

The whole epigram seems full of verbal reminiscences of the Virgilian story of Cacus' 'maesta iuvenca,' recalling Virgil's 'forma superante iuencas'; 'Grylli tenebras' a reminiscence of 'fumiferam noctem commixtis igne tenebris'; 'fugit ilicet ocior Euro' recalled in 'currit ad Europen,' and possibly 'centum pendentia tecta columnis' was suggested by 'saxis suspensam hanc aspice rupem.'

A good deal of course depends on the relation of place, the Porticus Pollae in the Campus Martius not being far from the Ara Maxima in the Forum Boarium.

EXUL.

Curepipe Camp,
Curepipe, Mauritius,
April 13, 1918.

REVIEWS

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI XIII.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII. Edited, with Translations and Notes, by B. P. GRENFELL, D.Litt., and A. S. HUNT, D.Litt. With six plates. Egypt Exploration Fund, and Humphrey Milford for the Oxford University Press. 1919.

ANOTHER volume of these precious documents, looked for with more eager anticipation than a new *Clayhanger* by Arnold Bennett, has now appeared: this contains literary documents, and we learn with pleasure that there are more to follow—including a papyrus of Theocritus. The editors' complete mastery of their subject, and their thorough and competent treatment, are known now to all the world; and our pleasant task is not to criticise, but to indicate some of the more interesting items.

A vellum leaf (1594), containing portions of *Tobit* XII., nearer to BA than to N, appears to represent an earlier and better tradition than either B or A, and a recension deserving of respect but independent of N. The three texts are given side by side, along with the cursives and the Old Latin versions. Among the other biblical fragments, 1597 although very defective, seems to represent 'a very ancient Greek text akin to the Western'; 1601-3 come from works not otherwise known. No. 1601 is from a treatise on the Passion, the others are from homilies; the theme of the last would not please the modern feminist.

The other documents are classical. No. 1604 has new fragments from Pindar's *Dithyrambs*, one being the first thirty lines of an ode for the Thebans which is often referred to by ancient writers, the metre solemn and simple, based on the epitrite. This is a welcome addition to our knowledge of Pindar, a noble piece of verse, containing moreover an allusion to the poet himself, ἐμὲ δ' ἐξαιρετον κάρνκα σοφῶν ἐπέων Μοῖσ' ἀνέστασ' Ἑλλάδι καλλιχόρῳ εὐχόμενον βρισαρμάτοις ὄλβου τε?

Θήβαις]. A few scholia are added. The short mark on the last *a* of Οὐρανίδαι (line 7) is of course correct, as there was a distinction in the pronunciation between nom. -αι and dat. -αῖ; the editors' note does not seem quite clear on this point: the vowel *a* is short, but the diphthong *ai* long. No. 1614 is the first Egyptian document containing parts of the extant odes, namely *Ol.* I., II., VI., VII. (probably fifth century). These fragments carry back the evidence for Pindar's text seven centuries, and as far as they go confirm the best MSS.: but II. 39 reads πατρωίαν, probably for πατρώϊ' αἶν, and VI. 77 ὄρος. No. 1606 has the three last columns from Lysias πρὸς Ἱπποθέρσην ὑπὲρ θεραπαίνης and against Theomnestus; the former was concerned with the doings of the Thirty Tyrants, and it confirms Grote's view of the terms of the amnesty arranged in 403. Another orator, supposed to be Hyperides, defends Lycophron in 1607. No. 1608 is part of the dialogue Alcibiades, by Aeschines Socraticus. An important historical fragment, 1610, ascribed to Ephorus, speaks of the capture of Eion and of Scyros, the battle of the Eurymedon, and events of that epoch, and with the aid of Diodorus a good deal is made intelligible. The new fragments, the editors point out, enable us to realise Diodorus' debt to Ephorus, to whom he seems to have added little of his own. No. 1611, a piece of literary criticism, quotes the actual words of Acusilaus of Argos, proving him to have written in an Ionic dialect: the quotation is singularly interesting for other reasons.

Fragments of extant authors, besides the pieces of Pindar already mentioned, include a small fragment of the Ajax representing a good text: in 699 it reads Μύσια, in 756 [τῇνδ' ἔθ'] ἡμέραν μίαν. Other small variants are given in Eurip. *Orestes* and Aristoph. *Plutus*. In No. 1618, parts of Theocritus, there are some important readings: XV. 72 ὄχλος ἀλάθεως, 86 φιληθεῖς, 98 πέρουσιν amongst them. A long piece of Hero-

dotus 1619 confirms the MS. tradition on the whole, including suspected interpolations; as has been noted before with other authors. No. 1620-3, Thucydides, as usual, do not correspond with either of the two families of MSS., which indicates that the division took place later than this period (second-

third century). Some improvements upon the ordinary text are to be found in 1525 Aeschines *In Ctesiphontem*, and the conjecture *ιέρα* for *γέρα* in § 18 is confirmed, while some proposed excisions are not supported.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

THE USE OF ΦΥΣΙΣ IN FIFTH-CENTURY GREEK LITERATURE.

The Use of Φύσις in Fifth-Century Greek Literature. By JOHN WALTER BEARDSLEE, JR. One vol. Royal 8vo. Pp. 126. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1918.

THE author states quite clearly at the outset that his intention is to trace the history of the word *φύσις* from its actual occurrences in extant Greek literature rather than to attempt to follow the development of the idea of nature in early Greece; the result of the latter course must be largely hypothetical, as the context is generally very slight in the fragments of Greek philosophy before Plato, and how can we hope to learn the exact force of any word without a context? In what we possess of Homer, Aeschylus, and Pindar *φύσις* is only found seven times; these are the only instances before the middle of the fifth century, and in all of them *φύσις* refers to the outward visible characteristics of a person or object. This use of *φύσις* for 'character' or 'qualities' is predominant throughout Greek literature from Homer to Aristotle; *φύσις* = 'origin,' which is perhaps the primary meaning, but which always remained rare, first occurs in Empedocles, who is also the first to use *φύσις* for 'human character,' comprising intellectual and moral attributes. In Herodotus, in the *Hippocratica*, and in Aristotle in his books on animals, we find *φύσις* used in the Homeric significance; this the author calls the 'natural history' use of the word. But, as we might expect, in the *Hippocratica* *φύσις* most frequently means 'temperament, constitution' from the physician's point of view. Sophocles and Euripides use

φύσις for the moral and intellectual character of a person; in the latter it also begins to mean 'human nature,' and in three places (the earliest datable is in the *Troades*, 415 B.C.) it stands for 'Nature,' and is the equivalent of *ὁ κόσμος* or *τὸ ὄλον*, though this meaning is probably far older than Euripides and sprang from the schools of physical philosophy. A chapter is devoted to *κατὰ φύσιν* and kindred phrases, and another to the phrase *περὶ φύσεως*, which is discussed at considerable length. In the interesting chapter on *φύσις* and *νόμος* the author warns us against overemphasising the distinction contained in this common antithesis; it was little more than a rhetorical device which became popular in the age of the sophists; there is no evidence that the antithesis was at all used by the early philosophers; indeed we have instances in which *φύσις* and *νόμος* are identified. A brief summary of the Platonic and Aristotelian usages forms the concluding chapter. The indexes extend over seventeen pages.

Misprints are very rare, but the following on page 92 is unfortunate: 'The original distinction between *φύσει* and *κατὰ φύσιν* is nicely illustrated . . . γυνὴ ἥτις παχέα παρὰ φύσιν ἐγένετο. . . ἥτις δὲ φύσει τοιαύτη ἐστὶ. . .'

There are some inconsistencies and many needless and tiresome repetitions, not merely from chapter to chapter, but sometimes within the space of a few lines; it would almost appear that the different chapters were originally written without reference to their place in the book as a whole, and that the final revision and co-ordination were hasty and incomplete. But it would be unfair to the author to lay too much stress

on these blemishes in a work which otherwise exhibits much patience and care both in the collection of the neces-

sary material and in its detailed interpretation.

G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ.

MISCELLANEA.

Proceedings of the British Academy: *Greek Civilisation as a Study for the People*. By W. RHYS ROBERTS. *The Value and the Methods of Mythologic Study*. By L. R. FARNELL. London: Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press.

University of Wisconsin: *Classical Studies in Honour of Charles Forster Smith*. By his Colleagues. Pp. 190. Madison: 1919.

University of Chicago: *Studies in Stichomythia*. By J. L. HANCOCK. Pp. 97. *Sycophancy in Athens*. By J. O. LOFBERG. Pp. 104. Chicago: University Press. 1917.

IF the account of this varied collection of studies is to go beyond a mere catalogue, we must keep in view some principle. And the principle we need is given to us by Professor Rhys Roberts. We are not concerned with Greek civilisation, however, in its fullest extent. Perhaps Hellenism would confine our outline within comfortable limits. Now there is some quality in Hellenism which distinguishes it from other subjects of study. On a perusal of the works already enumerated, it appears to be this. The Greeks we have in view were, as compared with other peoples, the possessors of unusually clear consciousness. They were susceptible to a large range of impressions, and they could discriminate between them. Other peoples, indeed, have had the same gifts. But the Greeks went further. Their language was the outcome of clear thinking and, in turn, clear thinking was fostered by their language. They developed on the lips of their best speakers and writers a form of expression almost adequate to all the demands of consciousness. Hence we can trace the Greek mind more clearly than any other, as it worked upon the problems of knowledge, of aesthetics, and of action. The French, of modern peoples, come per-

haps nearest to these Greek excellences. The Romans, in antiquity, were in like manner the best interpreters of the Greek tradition. But Greek literature alone is eternally modern. There is nothing so hopelessly antiquated in Greek literature as last year's newspapers. Clearly apprehended and clearly expressed consciousness is rarely to be found in our English tradition. People nowadays would accord to mathematical studies the functions which are here indicated. But the clarity of mathematics is disappearing, and this process will be quickened when mathematics forgets its Greek origin.

Candidly I suffer myself badly from confused thinking and inability to express myself. An apology is therefore due to the authors now passed under review, if I apply this personal need as a test. Mr. Farnell leads up in his admirable summary to the conclusion that even legend has a historical footing and brings us down to solid earth. With a sigh of relief we can shake ourselves free from the phantasms in which some fashionable mythologists delight. The Classical Studies from Wisconsin, in honour of Charles Forster Smith, are creditable to the recipient. We may be especially grateful to Mr. Fiske, who deals with 'The Plain Style in the Scipionic Circle,' and to Mr. C. N. Smiley for his paper on 'Seneca and the Stoic Theory of Literary Style.' But although the setting is Roman for these subjects, after all we are left sitting at the feet of Greek masters. It is enough to remember that Greek was almost supreme in Rome itself for the five centuries which are bisected at the Christian era. Chicago sends dissertations on 'Sycophancy in Athens,' by Mr. Lofberg, and on 'Stichomythia' by Mr. Hancock. Those who are specially interested in the topics dealt with by these writers will find the materials well displayed and clearly arranged.

At this moment when all the arts of

the sycophant are being brought, with or without intention, to play upon the Demos, and when, more than at any time within living memory, public statements of fact are coloured by entrenched interests or by the propaganda of innovators, the main use of Greek studies is found in the illumination which they shed upon human motives, and in the

clear judgments which the Greeks, above all other nations, passed upon them. The Greek knew when he was lying. To-day the Demos, and his sycophants, are rarely conscious of the truth even when they hit upon it. Professor Rhys Roberts goes far in his suggestion of the remedy.

FRANK GRANGER.

SOME SCHOOL BOOKS.

A Greek Reader for Schools, adapted from Aesop, Theophrastus, Lucian, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato. Edited by C. E. FREEMAN and W. D. LOWE. Pp. 142. Clarendon Press. 3s.

'THE book is an attempt to make real Greek literature easy enough for those who have a fair knowledge of elementary grammar. For this purpose much of the original text has been omitted, and in some cases it has been necessary to simplify sentences and phrases, but very little that is actually new has been introduced.'

A few years ago Dr. Lowe, in an attempt to make Virgil easy, wrote the following lines:

saepe fugam Danai Troia optavere relictā
et cupiere fatigati componere bellum,

and

turba hortatur ut effigies ducatur in urbem.

Obviously that is not real Virgil, and in the same way one feels sometimes in reading this book, though there is nothing so shocking as in the Virgil, 'That is not real Greek literature.' Take the selection from the *Apology*, for instance, and you will feel that the quality is gone. It may be a little easier than Plato, but it is not capable of stirring the same interest and admiration. A class that is capable of reading these pieces with their large and varied vocabulary could easily be taught to read some real Greek and would enjoy it more. They would, no doubt, need a little more help, especially at first, but they would be more likely to feel that it was worth while to learn Greek. Fewer boys begin Greek nowadays, but they begin at a later age, and are more

alive to the interest of the literature and the language, and more capable of getting over the difficulties.

But the book has good points. The passages are generally well selected, the introduction to each author is very well written, the Greek is printed in a notably large, clear type.

Bell's One Term Latin Classics: (1) *Livy's Veii and the Etruscan Confederacy* (Book V. 1-32, with a few omissions). Edited by S. WINBOLT. Pp. 5+45+14. (2) *Cicero Pro Milone* (much abridged). Edited by C. E. LAURENCE. Pp. 2+33+8. 1s. 3d. each.

The aim of this series is to provide books which shall not be too long to read in a term, and which, though abridged, shall be in a sense complete. They are printed in a good, large type, and are bound in limp cloth. The brief notes are intended only to 'help the student to a quick understanding of the text.' More might be done in the few pages of Introduction to interest the reader in the subject.

Ad Limen. By C. F. WALTERS and R. S. CONWAY. Pp. 129. J. Murray. 2s. 6d.

This is a supplement to *Limen* from Ex. LXXVIII. to the end. It contains reading and exercises similar to those in the original book, and twenty-four graduated test-papers on *Limen*. There are at the end vocabularies of the additional words introduced in this book.

The Cambridge University Press has published two books by Mr. T. C. WEATHERHEAD, each in two parts:

- (1) *Biennium Latinum*, a translation and composition book for beginners (pp. 146; 2s. 6d. net), which is intended to be used with a Card of First Rules (8d. net); and (2) *Further Rules for Latin Prose* (pp. 108; 2s. net), to be used with a volume of *Exercises* (pp. 192; 2s. 6d. net).

The last-named volume includes 173 exercises of detached sentences, a number of exercises on *oratio obliqua* and 'periods,' and 51 historical passages a little more difficult than those generally set in Responsions. The writer is an experienced schoolmaster, and has evidently for a long time been interested in the teaching of Latin. He tells us that he has come to the conclusion that 'what with full Vocabularies and Notes, and the Accidence printed in the same volume,' the beginner has had things made too easy for him. Accordingly, in *Biennium* the words are introduced gradually in separate lists, which are intended to be learnt by heart, and no general vocabulary is given to help those who have failed to learn them. In the second book a Vocabulary is given, but it does not include the commonest words. The Rules, too, are bound in separate volumes, presumably in order that the pupil may be required at times to show that he has mastered them.

The Exercises are well constructed, but some of the Rules seem to us unsatisfactory. E.g. 'Verbs governing a Dative in the Active must be used only impersonally in the Passive.' According

to this we must not write *Epistula mihi reddita est* for *reddo* governs a Dative. The Rule is of course meant to apply only to Intransitive Verbs, but this does not stand out clearly, for as the second part of the Rule runs, 'Intransitive Verbs must, in the Passive, be used impersonally only,' the pupil may well think that the first part applies to Transitive Verbs. (2) In the Rules for *Oratio obliqua* we read, 'N.B.—Be careful to remember that in the Latin Infinitive, the Present stands also for the Imperfect.' This means, we suppose, that *Dixit se scribere* may represent *Scribebam*. We should very much like to see an example, for the doctrine is not confirmed by our own experience of Latin, nor is it supported by the better grammars (cp. Gildersleeve, § 653). But we have seen similar statements in some other elementary books, and we often find that boys have been taught to speak of the Present and Imperfect Infinitive. (3) As is often the case in elementary composition books a good many uncommon types of sentence are introduced. For instance, is there sufficient evidence for such a sentence as *Incertum est num futurum sit ut urbs capiatur*? Is it really idiomatic Latin? The fact seems to be that the Roman never took to this form of expression, because he found the present or imperfect subjunctive conveyed the meaning clearly enough (e.g. Cicero, *Pis.* 79); if it did not he could help it out with an adverb or turn the sentence into the active.

Σ.

POSSIDIUS' LIFE OF ST. AUGUSTINE.

Sancti Augustini Vita Scripta a Possidio Episcopo. Edited, with revised Text, Introduction, Notes, and an English Version, by H. T. WEISKOTTEN. (Dissertation for Doctorate.) 5½" x 8". Pp. 176. Paper. Princeton: University Press (and Clarendon Press).

THIS carefully edited rendering of the work of Possidius is based on a collation of ten of the earlier known MSS., close attention being paid to various

readings in other copies. The printed texts of the *Vita* were ordinarily included in St. Augustine's works, and no separate edition earlier than that of Salinas, printed at Rome in 1731, is known. The *textus receptus* dates back to the Louvain edition of 1564.

Written about A.D. 432 in a plain and somewhat commonplace style, corresponding to the Latinity of the period, and with no great pretension to literary merit, it yet occasionally rises to a high

level. Discarding numerous text alterations made by previous editors without authority, the present editor's purpose has been to reproduce, as nearly as possible, what Possidius wrote, rather than what some assumed he should have written. This in itself is a laudable endeavour, and serves to enhance the value of a work for which many have long waited.

The life of St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, up to the time of his conversion to the Christian faith, contained in his *Confessiones*, is continued to the time of his decease in the *Vita* bequeathed to us by his faithful and intimate friend, Possidius, a native of Proconsular Africa, who became Bishop of Calama in Numidia about A.D. 400. It would appear that Possidius is only known in connection with St. Augustine and the graceful biography derived for the most part from St. Augustine himself. Both men had painful experience of the trials incidental to the troublous times through which the North African Church of the fifth century was called to pass. Upon the Vandals invading Africa in 428, Calama was taken, never again to rise. Possidius took refuge in the city of Hippo with Augustine, who died there during its siege in the arms of his devoted colleague. The influence of St. Augustine and his association with Possidius is discernible throughout the *Vita*, not only in the precise views enunciated but in the actual use of words and forms of expression. Among other features of interest which render the work serviceable are the numerous sidelights upon ecclesiastical usages and the conditions under which the early Church laboured.

Some singular points are observable in the text—e.g. the balanced antithesis employed, wherein every word in the first member of a passage is made to correspond with a word in the second member having a like construction with the same final syllable. The use by Possidius of the word *Romaniae* as applied to distinguish the world of Roman

civilisation, viewed apart from the Roman Empire, and *impraetermissee* = incessantly, are among the earliest instances of their use in Latin literature. There are several uncommon and post-classical words scattered throughout the text.

The quaint allusion to the habit of tale-bearing at the table is well illustrated in St. Augustine's domestic ordering. We are told that he set himself *contra pestilentiam humanae consuetudinis*, and had this inscription on his table:

Quisquis amat dictis absentum rodere vitam,
Hac mensa indignam noverit esse suam.
(cap. xxii.).

Possidius quotes an unidentified elegiac couplet by a secular poet desirous of remaining a living voice after death, who directed that the following inscription should appear on his monument:

Vivere post obitum vates vis nosse viator?
Quod legis ecce loquor, vox tua nempè mea
est.
(cap. xxxi.).

It would be interesting to learn its authorship.

Mr. Weiskotten has given a body of various readings as footnotes; those of a general character are supplied in some twenty pages at the end of the volume. The bibliography is brief and far from satisfactory. No mention is made of any English translation, but it must not be forgotten that Abraham Woodhead (1608-1678), in an English version of the *Confessions*, carried the life of Augustine to its close out of Possidius. The *Indiculus*, the earliest detailed list of St. Augustine's writings, added by Possidius to the *Vita* is also omitted. A small and poorly executed map of Provincial Africa, based upon that in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, appears at the end of the volume. The work is altogether worthy of a better 'setting' than that in which it appears.

C. H. EVELYN-WHITE.

A LATIN ANTHOLOGY.

Latin Poetry: From Catullus to Claudian.
An Easy Reader chosen by C. E.
FREEMAN. One vol. Octavo. Pp.
176. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1919.
3s. net.

THE underlying idea of this volume of annotated extracts is distinctly good; for it aims at providing varied and at the same time easy reading in Latin poetry 'for those who have some knowledge of Virgil and Ovid.' The title, however, is rather too wide for a collection of extracts from only nine Latin poets, two of whom, Virgil and Ovid, are in a sense specifically subsumed. Probably the editor had limits of space assigned; but in that event I should have been inclined to advocate the reduction of excerpts from Virgil and Ovid, and—more fully to justify the title—the inclusion of suitable passages from several other authors. I should even have pleaded for a little of Lucretius to represent the hexameter of Catullus' great contemporary, *e.g.* such a passage as the opening of the second book; and, if Juvenal did not square with the editor's purpose, then a few citations from Valerius Flaccus and Martial, with something at least of the *Mosella* of Ausonius. In all these cases there are pieces where no excessive difficulty need be feared, if the pupil were fortified with notes of the excellent type which Mr. Freeman has written; and, in particular, parts of the *Mosella* would make appeal through the poet's eye for the picturesque. These suggestions are offered in a spirit of complete sympathy with the editor's commendable desire to extend the reading of Latin poetry in schools.

Biographic facts and literary characterisation are supplied in the sketches prefixed to each of the nine sets of extracts; and they are supplied adequately enough to be in themselves interesting and to make the selections more profitable subjects of study. There are in all 62 extracts: 7 from Catullus, 9 from Virgil, 10 from Horace, 7 from Tibullus, 6 from Propertius, 8 from Ovid, 5 from Lucan, 7 from Statius, 3 from Claudian; and good taste has been shown in choosing with regard to beauty and

simplicity. Horace is represented entirely as a lyric poet, and rightly so, when the object of the book is remembered: eight odes are quoted in full, and two more in part. The extracts from Lucan will be welcome to teachers: they are well spread, being drawn from Books I., III., V., VII., and IX. of the *Pharsalia*. A comparison of the selections from Statius with a complete text will prove that, by judicious omission of more difficult or more artificial portions, a satisfactory degree of simplicity has been secured. I am glad, by the way, that the note on 'The Villa of Pollius' takes *dat natura locum* in the ordinary sense, 'Nature supplies the site' (for the house); because this appears to be more germane to the context than the artificial meaning which has been adopted by Professor Slater in his translation, 'Nature is beaten off the field.' The notes are brief and business-like, and avowedly avoid controversy of any kind.

To my mind, the first passage chosen from Statius, 'on the Anniversary of Lucan's Birthday,' would have gained in value by being continued four lines after *annos Culicis Maroniani*, so as to include Calliope's imagined prophecy of Lucan's superiority to Ennius, Lucretius, Varro Atacinus, and Ovid:

cedet musa rudis ferocis Enni,
et docti furor arduus Lucreti,
et qui per freta duxit Argonautas,
et qui corpora prima transfigurat.

A note on the metres of Catullus' *Dianae sumus in fide* and *Collis o Heliconii* would have been serviceable, and might have been expected all the more that brief comment is made on the Catullian specimens of hendecasyllabic metre and scazon (p. 8 and p. 86). In the introductory note to Propertius the name of the epigrammatist of Alexandria should be, not Philetus, but Philetas, as is clear from Propertius III. i. 1.

The usefulness of the book is enhanced by an index of proper names and a vocabulary.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

SHORT NOTICES

The Rise of the Equites in the Third Century of the Roman Empire. By CLINTON WALKER KEYES. Pp. 54. Oxford University Press (on behalf of Princeton University Press). 3s. 6d. net.

In the above dissertation Dr. Keyes examines critically the evidence furnished by the hundred years preceding the accession of Diocletian for the gradual replacement of 'senatorii' by 'equites' in the administration of the Roman Empire, and, without going into the motives which inspired that change—which, as he says, have been discussed elsewhere—shows how far the tendency to exalt the latter order at the expense of the former had been in operation before the time of the remodelling of the Empire. The author deals with the matter first from the civil, then from the military side, and finally discusses the question, To what extent the separation of civil and military government in the provinces was connected with the change from senatorial to equestrian officials? The subject is, of course, a very difficult one, the evidence, epigraphical and other, being, as is so often the case in momentous happenings in Roman history, far from satisfactory; but Dr. Keyes uses his materials to the best advantage, and his conclusions seem very convincing. He felt himself compelled to discuss at rather great length the status and duties at different periods of that rather perplexing person, the 'praefectus castrorum,' and to show how confusion has arisen between this officer and the latter-day equestrian legionary commander. The author's remarks on this latter topic are very illuminating.

T.

The Syntax of High-School Latin: A Co-operative Study. Edited by LEE BYRNE. Revised Edition. Pp. 60. 9" x 6". University of Chicago Press. \$ 0.75.

THE object of this book is to help teachers to decide what parts of syntax

are most necessary in the first four years of the study of Latin and in what order they should be introduced. It is assumed that our chief aim will be to develop the power of reading Latin, and that therefore we must make our pupils familiar with the constructions which occur commonly in school reading. Certain books which are very generally read at an early stage in the schools of the United States are selected for scrutiny, viz. Caesar, *B.G.* I-IV.; Cicero, in *Catilinam* I-IV., *de imperio Pompei, pro Archia*; Virgil, *Aen.* I-VI. Statistics of the syntax of these books have been elaborately worked out by fifty collaborators, and the results are set before us in tables and diagrams. The Introduction is excellent.

In our own country the teaching of Latin is too much governed by tradition. The hours devoted to the subject have been much cut down of late years. Boys begin later, and in many cases leave off earlier than they used, but the course of study is not sufficiently adapted to the new conditions, and numbers of details are learned in the early stages which the pupil will probably never find useful, rare words, exceptional forms, unusual constructions. These things are well worthy of study when they occur, but a knowledge of them is not an indispensable preliminary to the reading of Caesar and Ovid nor to the writing of Latin Prose. They retard and discourage the learner so that he feels that he is making but little progress with the language, and is therefore inclined to go on the Modern Side and try some other studies.

The merit of this book is that it shows not only what parts of syntax may be omitted or passed over lightly in the first few years, but also what parts must become so familiar that they can be applied without any conscious effort.

It may be worth while to mention a few other books which are very useful to anyone who wants to answer such questions as often occur to one in teaching Latin Prose: Is this sentence really good Latin? What is the Clas-

sical usage? Is this construction common enough to be of importance to learners in their first few years? The most useful perhaps are H. Merguet's *Lexica* (1) to the Speeches (2) to the Philosophical Writings of Cicero, and H. Meusel's *Lexicon Caesarianum*. These books give under each word every example of its occurrence. They are costly, but it is well worth while to

have them at hand. Another very useful book, especially because of the large number of examples quoted, is the new edition of Volume II. of R. Kühner's *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. C. Stegmann, the reviser of this volume, often adds useful notes as to the frequency of the occurrence of a construction.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

MEETING OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION.

THE seventeenth general meeting of the Classical Association was held at Newcastle and Durham from April 14 to 17. On Wednesday evening the Lord Mayor of Newcastle received the members in the Laing Art Gallery, and short lantern lectures were delivered by Mr. W. H. Knowles on the excavations at Corbridge, and Mr. Gerald Simpson on the Roman Wall. The latter summarised the evidence which showed Hadrian to be the first builder of the wall.

On Thursday the proceedings were also at Newcastle, the Bishop presiding through the day, in the absence of the Bishop of Durham, President of the local branch. To the great regret of the members Dr. Warde Fowler, the president, under medical orders, did not attend the meeting, but his presidential address on 'The Imagination of the Romans' was sympathetically read for him by Professor R. S. Conway. While admitting that the Romans differed in this respect from the Greeks, and in particular had not the myth-making faculty which is allied to Greek anthropomorphism, Dr. Fowler dwelt on the idealised portrait as characteristic of Rome, and especially to be found in Livy's first decade. He also dealt with the imaginative power of Lucretius and Virgil. A hearty vote of thanks was passed to the President. After lunch in Armstrong College, the Association listened to two exceptionally interesting papers. Professor Wight Duff, of Newcastle, dealt with the poet Martial, emphasising his warm-hearted nature and love of natural beauty, and illustrating

his points by many most felicitous translations. Canon Cruickshank gave an interesting paper on Bentley, including a reference to his unpublished notes on Lucretius. Tea in Armstrong College was followed by a visit to the Black Gate Museum, and in the evening a reception took place at the College, the Principal (Sir Theodore Morison) welcoming the guests. Professor H. J. Rose, of Aberystwyth, read a paper on the 'Orientation of the Dead in Greece and Italy,' giving an interesting survey of the subject.

Friday's proceedings were at Durham. A debate took place on 'Latin in Advanced Courses in Secondary Schools,' and it was resolved to urge the Board of Education to restore the position of Latin as part of the 'Modern Studies' group, so that it could be combined with History, English, or French, as in 1917-18. It was pointed out that the London University stood alone in endorsing the new regulations for 1918-19, while all other examining bodies had refused to modify their own schemes of higher certificate examination, and to make Latin a subject only to be combined with Greek. A strong but not unanimous opinion was expressed in favour of a new advanced course in Latin and English only. After the discussion Canon Cruickshank kindly described the Roman remains in the Chapter Library, and the Council of Durham Colleges entertained the members to lunch in the magnificent hall of University College. At the business meeting in the afternoon the reports of Council and the Journals Board were

adopted; the Treasurer presented his report, in which he announced that the number of members had risen to 1,700, but the cost of printing made it imperative that there should be a large increase of membership, or otherwise the subscription would have to be raised. The election of Dr. Walter Leaf as President of the Association for 1920-21 was carried unanimously, on the motion of Professor Cruickshank, seconded by Professor H. Browne, of University College, Dublin. The retiring President, Dr. Wight Duff, and the Master of University College, Oxford, were added to the list of Vice-Presidents. Mr. Norman Gardiner was re-elected Treasurer. In place of Professor Slater and Professor Ure, who retired, Professor A. C. Pearson, of Liverpool University, and the Rev. G. C. Richards, of Oriel College, Oxford, were elected secretaries. The vacancies on the Council were filled by the election of Miss Higgs (Roan School for Girls), Dr. Crees (Crypt Grammar School, Gloucester), Professor G. Norwood (Cardiff), Professor Slater (Bedford College), and Mr. E. A. Upcott (Wellington College). It was announced that the next meeting would be held at Cambridge at the end of July or beginning of August, 1921, and that American scholars would be invited to attend. A cordial vote of thanks to the hosts was moved by Mr. Richards, seconded by Mr. A. Bruce Roberts, H.M.I. (Leeds). Bishop Welldon then kindly entertained the members to tea at the Deanery.

In the evening, at Newcastle, the Armstrong College Dramatic Society gave a very fine performance of Euripides' *Electra* (in Professor Gilbert Mur-

ray's translation) in the King's Hall at Armstrong College. Professor Wight Duff is to be congratulated on the brilliant success of the representation. He was fortunate in having a good trainer in Mr. Vernon Brown, a sympathetic musician in Mr. W. G. Whitaker, and a clever scene-painter in Mr. R. J. S. Bertram, who skilfully adapted an illustration in Wordsworth's *Greece*; but the whole caste rose to the occasion. The chorus, led by Miss M. Wade, sang and danced with perfect ease and grace.

In spite of the broken weather twenty-one were bold enough to visit Corbridge and the Wall on Saturday. Mr. Knowles described the excavations at Corstopitum, and the party proceeded along the Wall under the guidance of Mr. Gerald Simpson, visiting Chollerford (camp and museum), Procolitia, Borcovicus, and ending at the fort by Haltwhistle burn.

During the meetings there was an exhibition of early printed books and facsimiles of MSS. in Armstrong College Library, and Mr. S. E. Wimbolt showed two models of a Pompeian house. Special mention should be made of the hospitality shown by the Durham and Newcastle hosts, which was organised by Mr. Basil Anderton, M.A., the City Librarian, whose classical catalogue was presented to any member of the Association who desired to possess a copy. Besides Mr. Anderton, the bulk of the work fell on Professor Wight Duff and Professor Cruickshank. To those three gentlemen in particular the thanks of the Association are due, and they are to be congratulated on the great success of the meeting.

OBITUARY

ROGER JAMES CHOLMELEY.

NOT a few scholars of note won distinction as soldiers in the war. Among them was R. J. Cholmeley, the editor of *Theocritus*. His death last summer was scarcely noticed at the time. He had lived long in the Dominions, and his English friends were few in number;

but he left behind him work of permanent value, and some of us who knew him well and admired his qualities and gifts feel his death as a grievous personal loss.

Born in 1872, educated at St. Edward's School, Scholar of Corpus

Christi College, Oxford—where he won the Chancellor's Prize for a Latin poem—Cholmeley held masterships, first at Manchester Grammar School, and afterwards at City of London School. In 1900 he went out in the Imperial Yeomanry to serve in the South African War, and later he became Professor of Latin at Rhodes University, Grahamstown. August 1914 found him Lecturer in Classics and Librarian in the University of Queensland at Brisbane.

Cholmeley was ever a fighter—his combative spirit reveals itself in his writing; well past forty, he was rejected for service by the Australian authorities; but he came to England, and obtained a commission in the Cheshire Regiment. He could have had, no doubt, some secure administrative post, but he was out for the real thing: he must be in the trenches, better still—out beyond the trenches exploring the enemy lines. For his daring and resource as Brigade Intelligence Officer near Messines, he was awarded the Military Cross. In the trenches he read Homer, Herodotus, and Caesar *Bell. Gall.* ('one of the best books ever written,' he called it.) He was wounded twice. Visited in hospital he was found, while in great pain, to be reading Plato's *Republic*.

Early in life he had acquired some knowledge of Russian. After the armistice he was sent to the Murmansk coast, and in that melancholy sequel to the war he lost his life. He was drowned in August, washed overboard on a wild night while overhauling guns required for action at daybreak, and the Service 'deplores the loss of a very capable and gallant officer.'

No attempt can be made here to deal adequately with the merits of his *Theocritus*. Yet it may be said the first edition (1901) was acclaimed by the late Professor Butcher as 'full of sound scholarship.' In later editions some immature judgements have been revised, and the results of recent research reckoned with. At the Antipodes, and even on active service, Cholmeley succeeded in keeping abreast of modern criticism. The last edition, 'revised and augmented,' issued since his death, represents his final judgements, and embodies not only the results of an exhaustive study of the continental commentators, but much original matter, including emendations which are almost certainly right. He has given us the standard English edition of the poet, which is not likely to be superseded for many years to come.

J. M. S.

NOTES AND NEWS

THE Annual General Meeting of the Northumberland and Durham Classical Association was held in Armstrong College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, on February 28, the chief business being the confirmation of arrangements for the entertainment of the Classical Association in Newcastle and Durham in April. Professor J. Wight Duff, who presided, announced the main details of the programme, which includes the reading of papers; inspection of the Roman inscribed stones at the Black-gate Museum, Newcastle, and in the Cathedral Library of Durham; demonstration of lantern-slides illustrative of the Roman Wall; receptions by the Lord Mayor of Newcastle, by Armstrong

College, and by the University; and, finally, the production in English of a Greek play. The play selected is the *Electra* of Euripides, which will be rendered by the Armstrong College Dramatic Society. Dr. Duff explained the progress made by the various sub-committees on problems connected with staging, dress, and music, and reported the arrangements proposed for hospitality and the establishment of a Guarantee Fund to cover expenses.

The business meeting was followed by a paper which Mr. Basil Anderton, M.A., read on 'The Lure of Translation.'

THE Prime Minister has appointed a Committee to inquire into the teaching

of Classics, and no doubt also to suggest what is their proper place in English education. The Chairman is Lord Crewe, and the members represent a large variety of opinions, amongst whom some are friends of the study, some perhaps not so. We hope Mr. Henderson may learn something, but it is not well to be too confident. However, this Committee, taken in conjunction with the pamphlet of the Reconstruction Board, in which the merits of Classics are set forth, is a sign that the fanatics of materialism will not have things all their own way.

Discovery has made its appearance, and very attractive it is. The scientific papers are written so that an ordinary man can understand them; even chemical elements cease to be the mysterious things of our school memories. The classical man need puzzle no longer over the secret of Philae, and it is to be hoped that that will not be the only secret revealed. But the March number has nothing specially for our delectation. May we suggest as a subject the pretty toys of Hero Alexandraeus?

CORRESPONDENCE

CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION,
LIVERPOOL BRANCH.
TO THE COUNCIL OF THE CLASSICAL
ASSOCIATION.

Classical Lectures to Secondary Schools.

GENTLEMEN,

We are desired by the President and Committee of the Liverpool Branch of the Classical Association to bring to your notice the following series of lectures to the senior pupils of Secondary Schools, which were arranged by the Branch during the autumn term of 1919. It is suggested that any publicity which you might care to give to the scheme might lead to its adoption by other Branches. If such were to be the case, the Committee of the Liverpool Branch would welcome any suggestions based on the experience of other Branches, since it was from a somewhat similar proposal put forward by the Leeds Branch in 1914 that the present series arose.

The following series of lectures was advertised in October:

THE GREEK AND ROMAN WORLD.

Lecture I.: Land and Sea, Professor Halliday.

„ II.: Towns and Temples, Professor Bosanquet.

„ III.: Social Life, Mr. Ormerod.

The lectures were held by permission in the Arts' Theatre of the University.

A circular letter was sent to thirty-one schools in the Liverpool area, of which twenty-two sent parties to the lectures. The first lecture was attended by 768 pupils, and, owing to the difficulty of accommodating so large an audience, it was decided that the audience should be divided for the second and third lectures, the number averaging 300 for each of the last four lectures.

In view of the request from the schools that the series should be continued, it has been decided by the Committee to offer the following courses during the Lent Term of the present year:

(a) *Junior Course* (for pupils below the School Certificate Standard):

Lecture I.: Ancient Athens, Professor Halliday.

„ II.: Ancient Sparta, Mr. Ormerod.

„ III.: Ancient Rome, Dr. Caton.

(b) *Senior Course*:

Lecture I.: Ancient Rome, Professor Bosanquet.

Lectures II. and III.: Roman Public Life, Mr. Smiley.

E. K. EAST,

N. A. ORMEROD,

*Hon. Secretaries,
Liverpool Branch, Classical Association.*

LIDDELL AND SCOTT.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,—Is there any permanent body which collects materials for new editions of Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*? Every scholar must discover a number of errors in that work, admirable as it is, and the persistence of some of these seems to show that the editors do not get the benefit. Here are a few: αἶρεν θεούς, Plato *Crat.* 425D, means 'lift up' (on the μηχανή), not 'call up'; ἀνάγκησις = 'quarrel,' Hdt. VIII. 69 (omitted); διὰρισμα, Porph. *de abst.* I. 7 (omitted); ἔγγυς, with participle, ἔγγυς τυφλῶν, 'nearly blind,' Plat. *Rep.* 508C (τυφλῶν is an adjective, not a participle); ἐνδεξιόμαι, 'to grasp with the right hand,' Eur. *I.A.* 1473 (it means 'to go round an altar' ἐνδέξια); εἰρείτης, Eur. *Tro.* 810 (omitted); προδρομή, 'a sally, sudden attack,' Xen. *Anab.* 4, 7, 10 (it means 'a stone projection'); σκυρωτή, Hesych. cited, Pind. *Pyth.* V. 93 ignored; ὑπορεῖνσθαι, 'to propose a question,' Plat. *Gorg.* 448E (it means 'to give a lead'). To whom should such corrections, not to mention notes of false references, dubious readings, etc., be sent?

I would further suggest that in future editions the redundant references to Homer should be cut down, and all the obsolete philology omitted. The space so saved might be partly used to quote, or at least refer to, the definitions of words given by ancient authors, especially the philosophers' definitions of moral and psychological terms.

F. M. CORNFORD.

Cambridge.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,—The following details, from an American source, of the attempt to fortify classical studies in that country, may be of interest to readers of the *Classical Review*. The centre of propaganda is the American Classical League, founded in 1919, under the presidency of Dean West, of Princeton. This association, besides its normal activities, publishes pamphlets, enlists the interest of editors of leading daily newspapers, furnishing them with timely news, and gaining their editorial support. Classical Clubs have been formed in great centres of the population, including not only teachers of the classics, but representatives of science, political and historical studies, law, medicine, engineering, architecture, etc., as well as leading men of affairs. The aim is to enlighten and influence public opinion.

It is to be hoped that our own Classical Association, to which classical studies in this

country already owe much, will plan and organise propaganda over here to bring home to the British public the significance of Greece and Rome to the modern world.

It is interesting to note that Princeton, which recently abolished its Compulsory Greek requirement, is making the following statement in its annual calendar: 'While provision is made whereby a substitute for Greek may be offered for admission to the course leading to the degree of B.A., and a substitute for Latin may be offered for admission to the course leading to the degree of B.Sc., students preparing for admission are strongly advised to take both Greek and Latin, as constituting with mathematics the best foundation for a liberal education in college studies.'

R. W. LIVINGSTONE.

CATULLUS XXI. I. 11.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—The following emendation of
meme (Ω) puer et sitire discet

I have been unable to find printed in any edition of Catullus with which I am acquainted. Can any of your readers tell me who is responsible for it?

Niraeus puer et sitire discet.

I found it in a contemporary hand in the margin of a copy of Guarinus' commentary (1521). The note runs as follows:

'Ergo hoc loco fortasse rectius Niraeus puer. ut derivatur a Nireo, ut Orphaeus, Thesaeus ab Orpheo et Theseo. Nireus formae splendore celebrari ab homero ignorat nemo. prop. Nirea non facies. Ouid. sit licet antiquo Nireus adamatus homero. hor. Quint. et reliqui.'

I am, sir,

Yours faithfully,

E. H. W. MEYERSTEIN.

ΔΑΙΜΩΝ IN HOMER.

I REGRET that I was unable to check all the statements in my paper before the article went to press, not having access to the necessary books. The following correction was sent, but arrived too late for insertion:

In vol. 33, p. 135, col. 1, l. 19, read: 'All that can be said is that in all these instances, with a single exception (ε 396 στυγερὸς δαίμων, in a simile where the adjective removes the necessity of understanding δαίμων as *per se* an evil power) . . .'

S. BASSETT.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Aristotle*. By Professor A. E. Taylor. $6\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 126. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1919. Cloth, 1s. 3d. net.
- Beazley* (J. D.) The Lewes House Collection of Ancient Gems. $8'' \times 10\frac{3}{4}''$. Pp. xii + 124. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920. Paper boards, 38s. net.
- Bulletin Philologique et Historique*. No. 1, January, 1920. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$. Brussels: M. V. Tourneur, 5, rue du Musée.
- Bywater* (J.) Four Centuries of Greek Learning in England. $9'' \times 6''$. Pp. 20. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1919. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Flosculi Graeci*. By A. B. Poynton. $7'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xii + 162. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.
- Forster* (E. S.) *Oeconomica*. $9'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 128. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920. Paper, 5s. net.
- Heath* (Sir Thomas L.) *Euclid in Greek*. Book I. $5\frac{1}{4}'' \times 7\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. vii + 239. Cambridge: University Press, 1920. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Holland* (F.) *Seneca*. $9'' \times 6''$. Pp. vii + 206. London: Longmans, 1920. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Hopkin* (J. C.) *A Handbook of Attic Red-Figured Vases*. Vol. II. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. viii + 600. Oxford: University Press, for Harvard University Press, 1919. Cloth, 35s. net.
- Kavanagh* (Ethna). *The Priest of Isis*. $6\frac{3}{4}'' \times 4\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. 45. London: John Long, 1920. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Livy* (Books VI.-X.). Oxford Text. Edited by C. F. Walters and R. S. Conway. $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$. Pp. xxviii + 384. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1919. Paper, 5s. net; cloth, 5s. 6d. net; India paper, 7s. 6d. net; interleaved, 10s. net.
- McFayden* (D.) *The History of the Title Imperator under the Roman Empire*. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. ix + 67. Chicago: University Press, 1920. Paper, 75 cents net.
- Meuwese* (A. P. M.) *De Rerum Gestarum divi Augusti Versione Graeca*. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6''$. Pp. xiii + 128. St. Michiels Gestel: O. Meuwese, 1920. Paper.
- Pasquali* (G.) *Orazio Lirico*. $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. viii + 792. Florence: Felice le Monnier, 1920. Paper.
- Phaedrus*. By J. P. Postgate. $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$. Pp. 144. Oxford: University Press, 1920. Paper, 4s. 6d.; cloth, 5s.; interleaved, 7s. 6d. net.
- Ramsay* (A. B.) *Inter Lilia*. $8'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 123. Cambridge: University Press, 1920. Cloth, 6s. 6d. net.
- Rostagni* (A.) *Giuliano L'Apostata*. $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 399. Torino: Fratelli Bocca, 1920. Paper, L. 28.
- Sargeant* (J.) *The Trees, Shrubs, and Plants of Virgil*. $8'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. vii + 149. Oxford: Blackwell, 1920. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Sikes* (E. E.) *Hero and Leander*. $7'' \times 4\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. 27. London: Methuen, 1920. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Studies in Philology*, XVI., No. 4. $6\frac{1}{2}'' \times 9\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 289-384. Published by the University of California. 75 cents.
- Studies in Philology*. Vol. XVII., No. 1, January, 1920. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 120. Boston, U.S.A.: Ginn and Co. Paper, \$1.00.
- The Anglo-Hellenic League*. No. 40: The Turks, Cardinal Newman, and the Council of Ten. By the Very Rev. Canon W. Barry. No. 41: Address of W. A. Lloyd. $8'' \times 5''$. Pp. 16. 3d. net each.
- Theander* (C.) *Ὁλοθυρή and ἰά*. $8\frac{3}{4}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 99-160. Upsala: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1916. Paper.
- Warren* (H. L.) *The Foundations of Classic Architecture*. $10'' \times 7\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. xvi + 357. London: Macmillan. Cloth, 32s. net.
- Willis* (G.) *The Philosophy of Speech*. $5\frac{1}{2}'' \times 8''$. Pp. 256. London: Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1920. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Xenophon*. By E. C. Marchant. $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$. Pp. 248. Oxford: University Press, 1920. Paper, 5s. net; cloth, 6s.; interleaved, 10s.

